DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 657 EC 005 464

TITLE	The Report on the 1968 Summer Institute on Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Cooperative Educational Research Lab., Inc., Northfield, Ill.; Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Illinois State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield. Dept. of Program Planning for the Gifted.
PUB DATE	Oct 68
NOTE	99p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.05
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel, Administrator Attitudes, Educational Programs, Evaluation Methods, *Evaluation Techniques, *Exceptional Child Education, *Gifted, Inservice Programs, *Institutes (Training Programs), Measurement Instruments, Measurement Techniques, *Program Evaluation, State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois, Illinois Gifted Program

ABSTRACT

A 2-week institute trained 30 public school personnel, all involved with the Illinois gifted program, as evaluators. An evaluation design, materials, and instruments were developed; the workshop evolved from evaluation planning to skill training in data gathering techniques. Evaluation in terms of each participant's local situation was stressed. Concerning the participants' progress, results indicated significant shifts in attitude toward evaluation as well as significant gains on the achievement test. The fact that the completed evaluation plans could be used by the participants was considered a meaningful success. Problems involved interaction, heterogeneity, and continued direction; suggestions were made for improvement. Over half of the document consists of materials and instruments used. A detailed text describing the training materials of evaluation used at the institute is available as EC 005 463. (JD)

ED039657

THE REPORT ON THE 1968 SUMMER INSTITUTE ON EVALUATION

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

July 29 - August 9, 1968

SPONSORED BY:

COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, INC. (CERLI)

Northfield, Illinois

CENTER FOR INSTRUCTIONAL RESEARCH AND CURRICULUM EVALUATION (CIRCE)

University of Illinois, Urbana

SUPPORTED BY:

DEPARTMENT OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FOR GIFTED YOUTH

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

STATE OF ILLINOIS

EVALUATION BY:

CERLI

OCTOBER, 1968

EC05446E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED0 39657

INTRODUCTION

The Cooperative Educational Research Laboratory, Inc. (CERLI) and the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE) cosponsored the Summer Institute on Evaluation conducted at the University of Illinois (Urbana) July 29 - August 9 and supported by the Department of Program Development for Gifted Youth, OFFICE of the SUPERINTENDENT of PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, STATE of ILLINOIS.

At the multi-purposed institute, the cosponsoring agencies demonstrated the feasibility of training nonresearch personnel to conduct evaluations, pilot tested a two-week training package and provided inservice training for the Gifted Evaluation staff.

In this document, the CERLI staff reports the planning, presentation and evaluation of the Summer Institute on Evaluation.

October, 1968

STAFF

Institute on Evaluation .....

Initiated by:
Ernest House - Project Manager, CERLI
Robert Stake - Associate Director, CIRCE, University of Illinois

Designed by:
Douglas Sjogren - Assistant Director, Human Factors Research Laboratory, Colorado State University (Fort Collins)
With assistance from:
R. Stake, E. House
Terry Denny - Director of Research, EPIE
Stephen Lapan - Program Assistant, CERLI

Directed by:
E. House, S. Lapan

Presented by:
R. Stake, T. Denny, D. Sjogren
Thomas Hastings - Director, CIRCE
With assistance from:
Gene Summers - Assistant Professor, Sociology, University of Illinois
Susan Feldman - Research Associate, University of Illinois
Robert Cunningham - Graduate Student, University of Illinois

Observed by:
Thomas Kerins - Program Assistant, CERLI
Sharon Gotch - Research Associate, CERLI
Billie Wilson - Research Associate, CERLI

Analyzed by:
Raynard Dooley - Program Associate, CERLI
E. House, S. Lapan, T. Kerins

Report edited by:
Florence Lockerby - Editor-Staff Writer, CERLI

CONTENTS

Introduction i

Staff ii

I. PLANNING 1

Purposes
Objectives
Rationale for Design
Participants

II. PRESENTATION 5

Basic Plan
Daily Activities/Historian's Commentary
Schedules
Training Materials

III. EVALUATION 17

Scheme
Observer's Report
Participants' Response
    Achievement
    Attitude
    Opinionnaire
    Interviews
    Evaluation Plans

IV. SUMMARY 61

APPENDIX 64
    Letter
    Brochure
    Application
    Observation Schedules
    Achievement Quiz
    Attitude Inventory
    Participant Opinionnaire
    Participant Critique Form
    Participant Interview Schedule (Parts I & II)

I. PLANNING THE SUMMER INSTITUTE ON EVALUATION

The institute was designed and presented to achieve the following purposes:

To provide for evaluation of local gifted programs within the Illinois Plan

To build a continuous assessment capacity into the Illinois Plan by training a cadre of evaluation leaders

To demonstrate the feasibility of training nonresearch personnel to conduct evaluations

To produce and field test an extensive set of evaluation training materials that can be used around the state and around the country

To provide inservice training for the Gifted Evaluation staff.

Objectives for the participants included:

Stimulus objectives:

It was intended that each participant would encounter:

The logical arguments for gathering evaluation information to assist in the making of rational decisions in the local project

An evaluation model around which the local evaluation efforts could be organized

Discussion of evaluation problems featuring the viewpoints of experienced evaluators, researchers, and administrators

A growing opportunity for sharing local project findings with staff members of other projects

Direction to an abundance of resources, personal and otherwise, to aid in the conduct of evaluation at the local level.

Performance objectives:

It was expected that each participant would:

Design components of an evaluation plan for local use

Make a table of contents for a summative evaluation report of his own local gifted program

Improve his facility for using the language and concepts of measurement and evaluation

Prepare to try out certain standardized classroom observation techniques that can be useful in evaluation studies

Examine prototype evaluation reports and read selections from the literature on evaluation

Work out solutions to a series of problems designed to simulate the conditions and circumstances of local gifted projects in Illinois.

Rationale for Design

Stake's "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation" provided the institute's conceptual framework for this model projects a comprehensive and interrelated view of evaluation that seemed desirable for the participants to acquire.

It also seemed important to involve participants in experiences related to the actual problems confronting them in their local school districts. Thus, the design for the institute synchronized theory and practice in order that the trainees might develop skills and collect materials they could utilize and apply in solving local problems.

During the first week, each participant was expected to develop an evaluation plan. In the initial sessions, Stake presented his model to orient the participants to evaluation and suggest types of data they might use. Model plans, embodying these ideas, were distributed. The remaining sessions dealt with various topics (classroom observation, research design, statistics) which would help participants to write their plans.

During the second week, it was hoped that participants would develop research skills that they would need to use in implementing their evaluation plans. In this context, continued work in statistics, test development, scale construction, questionnaire construction and interview training were presented or available.

Participants

Because the institute was so closely associated with the Gifted Child Program, individuals directly involved in it initially were contacted: Demonstration Center Directors, Reimbursement Center Directors, Experimental Project Directors and state staff in charge of these projects. Upon request, the Director of the State Title IV project recommended some local Title III Directors whose backgrounds included research methods. These individuals seemed particularly eligible for the institute since they were involved with innovative programs that had been only superficially evaluated, if at all. CERLI sent a letter and brochure (Appendix 1 and 2) to each of these potential participants.

In all, some 500 letters and brochures were mailed and some 100 recipients responded by requesting application blanks (Appendix-3). Forty applications were completed and returned and from this number 33 applicants were selected.

Three criteria determined the acceptability of applicants: background in academic courses; future job responsibility for conducting an evaluation in a local district; experience in research and evaluation projects. Among the applicants, some teachers were accepted even though there had been some effort to restrict enrollment to administrators. The fact that the teachers might have some job responsibility for evaluating their programs during the coming year and the fact that there were so few applicants altered the original selection scheme.

After analyzing the selection process, the CERLI staff offers the following suggestions for improvement:

1. In order to more precisely delineate an applicant's background, the application form should include: categories identifying major fields of study and graduate hours in statistics, tests and measurements, etc.; specific information about past and current professional experience and positions.

2. In order to determine an applicant's potential, some type of diagnostic test might be constructed and administered to all applicants. With this criterion, background and position then would become secondary items in the selection process.

3. Since teachers ordinarily do not have the authority or the resources available to evaluate a program, some prior commitment should be made by their administrator who could authorize their active participation in an evaluation. Otherwise, teachers attending the institute could be frustrated if they cannot use the skills they have developed and their participation may actually have been or seemed a wasteful effort.

II. PRESENTATION of the SUMMER INSTITUTE on EVALUATION

Basic Plan

To inform participants about the workshop program and its continuity and content, a preliminary schedule was prepared and sent to them.

During the first week, all participants (either individually or in small groups) worked on developing a plan to collect information on some specific question. Presentations dealt with concepts or ideas related to the problem of developing a plan.

During the second week, participants worked with individual problems such as statistical exercises and development of instruments for their evaluation plans. Formal presentations dealt with the development of skills that an evaluator uses to solve problems of data collection.

Daily Activities and Historian's Commentary

Each of the following "daily reports" presents the statement of objectives that participants were given and the historian's account of the activity. (See pages 13-14 for a graphic comparison of the planned and the actual schedule that evolved.)

WEEK ONE

Monday

The morning sessions will be for introductions and an orientation to the workshop. In these sessions we hope to elicit from you the general and specific evaluation problems that concern you and the expectations you have of the workshop.

Bob Stake will make the first of two presentations of his evaluation model in the first afternoon session. These presentations (the second is on Tuesday a.m.) will provide you with a general overview of the model. Subsequent presentations will be relevant to specific components of the model, and they will assist you in translating the model into a specific plan. You should have read the article "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation" before hearing the presentations by Dr. Stake.

Three videotapes of consultation sessions between a school person and an evaluation expert have been prepared. Each tape projects a session that was held prior to the development of one of the three evaluation-plan examples. Showing of one of these tapes has been scheduled for the fourth session on Monday.

- -

Changes: The evaluation model was presented by Dr. Stake at the second session at 10:15 and the expectations of the participants were elicited in the small groups during the afternoon. This was done because a faculty meeting scheduled for the afternoon required Dr. Stake's presence. There is little evidence for judging whether or not this change made a difference except that the participants stated that they wished there had been a chance to meet informally that first morning. The expectations session might have provided this opportunity. Also it is unclear whether or not Stake's presentation of his model might have confused some of the participants to the extent that their expectations became fuzzy.

Tuesday

A continuation of the presentation on the Stake model will come in the first Tuesday session.

The second session will be a work session during which you can begin work on your evaluation plan. You may want to study the example plans at this time.

Material of relevance to the observations cells of the model will be presented in the third session. Topics that will be considered in this session include operational definitions and principles of test selection.

The first part of the fourth session on Tuesday will be a presentation on the use of certain resource materials such as The Mental Measurements Yearbook, Research in Education, and Review of Educational Research. The remaining time in the session will be a work session.

Tuesday's fifth session is planned as the time when Dr. Stake will use one of the videotapes to discuss the role and task of the consultant.

- -

Changes: The second session was changed from an individual work session to a group work session in which the CERLI staff attempted to act as catalysts in having the participants discuss Stake's model and react to it according to their own planning problems in the hope that they would develop a better understanding of Stake's model through group discussion.

Dr. Denny brought the participants to the ERIC research center on the U. of I. campus for his fourth session discussion on resource material. The operation of the center was explained by the staff and a tour of the facility was arranged. Explanatory materials were distributed along with a promise of cooperation if any of the participants wished to use ERIC's facilities in the future. The reaction seemed mixed according to background. Those participants with a background in research methods were much more impressed than those who had little training in this area.

Wednesday

A second presentation on conditions of observation is scheduled for the first Wednesday session. Dr. Denny will discuss classroom observation procedures.

The second and third sessions are scheduled as work sessions. Hopefully by the end of the third session you will have defined a rough outline of your evaluation plan. The rest of the videotapes will be shown on a schedule from 10:15 - 3:00.

The format of evaluation reports will be presented in the fourth session.

- -

Changes: The fourth session was changed from "Report Format" to "Textbook Evaluation." Dr. Stake thought that the participants were not ready for his lecture on report format at that time. Instead, a graduate student spoke about textbook evaluation. The change definitely brought about positive and negative reactions. The positive reaction was that the participants were able to come out of the protective shell which they had constructed to avoid interaction with the professors. The negative reaction was that the participants reacted very strongly against the unsubstantiated opinions that the student had made, and they thought he had nothing at all to contribute to them.

Thursday

The first session will be devoted to a presentation on ways to establish standards as bases for judgments. The content will be primarily on research designs that might be used in evaluation situations. The validity of the data obtained in the various designs will be stressed.

The second session will be a presentation on observational procedures not commonly used but with rich potential. The topic is unobtrusive measures.

The third and fourth sessions are planned as work sessions. Hopefully your plans will be ready to be submitted to the staff at the end of session four on Thursday.

The staff will develop some artificial data for your plan on Thursday night.

These data will be used by you in the Friday exercise. Your plans will also be read by the staff and feedback provided you by Monday.

(Note: the exercise with artificial data was not assigned as the director thought the work might be "too advanced" for participants to handle.)

The fifth session will be a presentation on statistical problems. This presentation and the first one on Friday will provide an overview of properties of scales and of certain statistical techniques.

- -

Changes: Dr. Stake asked his graduate students who are preparing for their Ph.D. to act as consultants to those participants who wanted more individual help in writing their evaluation plans. The sessions seemed profitable for the participants and for the students who received practical consulting experience.

Friday

The first session is planned as a presentation on statistics.

The second session is a work session in which you will analyze the data provided you and prepare a report of your evaluation. Much of the report will have been written as the material prepared during the week. The reports will be duplicated over the weekend and distributed on Monday.

The third session is scheduled as a time for evaluation of the first week's activities in the workshop. You will be asked to complete some evaluation instruments, but we also hope you will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the week as you perceived them. The planned schedule for the second week will be presented and perhaps revised on the basis of your expressed interests and desires.

- -

Changes: During the second session one of the statistical exercises was distributed for individual and group practice. Since the vast majority of the participants had completed and handed in their plans by this time, the second session activities were eliminated and the third session activity of interviewing the participants was moved up. Therefore, the first week's session was ended by noon.

WEEK TWO

Monday

The first session on Monday is an orientation to the second week. This will be needed especially if changes are suggested by points you raise in the Friday evaluation session. If time permits, part of the first session will be available for you to think about your individual activity for the second week. Feedback on your plans may also be provided.

The second session is planned as a presentation on judgments. Techniques for making judgments will be covered.

The third session is planned as a panel to bring up and discuss problems that confront an evaluator such as inadequate questionnaire returns, administrator interference, etc.

- -

The orientation for the second week's activities lasted only thirty minutes. The remainder of the time allotted for the first session was spent with role playing in small groups. One participant would explain his evaluation plan (which had been handed back with comments but not duplicated because of a lack of facilities) and the others would ask questions while playing the roles of parents, administrators, teachers, etc.

Tuesday

The Tuesday presentations are on test construction. Topics to be covered are measuring achievement, measuring higher-order mental process, measuring attitudes and scaling. Principles of test construction will be stressed. The presentations will be in the first, third, and fifth sessions. The second and fourth sessions will be work sessions.

- -

Changes: Dr. Stake recommended that Mrs. Susan Feldman lecture on questionnaire construction during the third session because of the relevance of the topic to her present work at the University.

The evening session on scaling was moved to the second session on Thursday morning for two reasons: first, many of the participants had stated weariness from night session during the first week; secondly, the voting at the Republican convention occurred this night and possibly the attendance and the interest of the participants could have been affected.

Wednesday

The first session on Wednesday is planned as an overview of survey procedures. The presentation will include material on kinds of information usually obtained in surveys and sampling considerations.

The construction of questionnaires and interview schedules is the topic assigned to the second Wednesday session.

The Wednesday afternoon and evening sessions are scheduled for an interview training exercise. Dr. Denny will conduct these sessions and will structure the situation for you.

- -

Changes: Dr. Denny recommended that Dr. Gene Summers, a sociologist at the University's Survey Research Laboratory, lecture on "Survey Procedures" because this area is his speciality.

Dr. Stake gave his lecture on test development which had been replaced by Susan Feldman's talk the previous day.

Thursday

The first two sessions on Thursday are planned as work sessions.

The Thursday afternoon sessions are planned for the second part of the interview training activities. The content of these sessions will follow up the Wednesday afternoon presentation.

- -

During the afternoon sessions, the CERLI staff conducted the remaining interviews with the participants. This was arranged to avoid the possibility of missing this information in the rush of data collection Friday. It became feasible since Dr. Denny was able to work with only a few people at a time in his interview training.

Friday

In the first session on Friday we have planned a critique and discussion of the evaluation-plan handout on the question "Has the gifted program had an effect on the achievement of the participating students?"

Dr. House will present some ideas on the establishment of an information pool in the second session. The information pool would be a central storage and clearinghouse of information on the gifted program in the state.

The third Friday session is planned as an evaluation session and one in which the end-of-workshop administrative details are handled. The workshop will close at the end of this session.

- -

The institute ended at noon. All the necessary data was collected after George Trout's speech.

WEEK ONE: SCHEDULE

	Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday	
	PLANNED	ACTUAL	PLANNED	ACTUAL	PLANNED	ACTUAL	PLANNED	ACTUAL	PLANNED	ACTUAL
Session #1 :30 - 10:30	Orientation and Setting	Orientation and Setting	Evaluation Model STAKE	Evaluation Model STAKE	Classroom Observation DENNY	Classroom Observation DENNY	Research Design SJOGREN	Research Design SJOGREN	Statistical Problems SJOGREN	Statistical Problems SJOGREN
Session #2 0:15 - 11:45	Expectation	Evaluation Model STAKE	Work Session	Group Work Sessions	Work Session (Videotapes)	Work Session (Videotapes)	Unobtrusive Measures	Unobtrusive Measures DENNY	Work Session	Work Session
Lunch 11:30 - 1:30										
Session #3 1:30 - 3:00	Evaluation Model STAKE	Expectation	Observation and Testing DENNY	Observation and Testing DENNY	Work Session	Work Session	Work Session	Work Session	Work Session	
Session #4 3:15 - 4:45	Videotape	Videotape	Resource Material Work Session	Resource Material Work Session	Report Format STAKE	Textbook Evaluation CUNNINGHAM	Work Session	Work Session	Evaluation	
Social and Dinner 5:00 - 7:30										
Session #5 7:30 - 9:00	Individual Work Session	Individual Work Session	Reactor Role Videotape STAKE	Reactor Role Videotape STAKE	Work Session	Work Session	Statistical Problems SJOGREN	Statistical Problems SJOGREN		

WEEK TWO: SCHEDULE

	PLANNED	ACTUAL	PLANNED	ACTUAL	PLANNED	ACTUAL	PLANNED	ACTUAL	PLANNED	ACTUAL
ession #1 30 - 10:30	Second Week Orientation	Second Week Orientation Group Work Role Playing	Measuring Cognitive Outcomes HASTINGS	Measuring Cognitive Outcomes HASTINGS	Survey Procedures DENNY	Survey Procedures SUMMERS	Work Session	Work Session	Evaluation Plan Critique HASTINGS	Evaluation Plan Critique HASTINGS
ession #2 :15 - 11:45	Judgments STAKE	Judgments STAKE	Work Session	Work Session	Questionnaire Construction STAKE	Test Development STAKE	Work Session	Scaling STAKE	State Program Evaluation	State Program Evaluation
Lunch :30 - 1:30										
ession #3 :30 - 3:00	Panel on Evaluation Problems	Panel on Evaluation Problems	Test Development STAKE	Questionnaire Construction FELDMAN		Lecture DENNY			Evaluation	
ession #4 :15 - 4:45	Work Session	Work Session	Work Session	Work Session	Interview Training DENNY	Interview Training DENNY	Interview Training DENNY	Interview Training DENNY	End	End
Social and Dinner :00 - 7:30										
Session #5 7:30 - 9:00	Work Session	Work Session	Scaling STAKE							
	Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday	

TRAINING MATERIALS

Pre-Package

Description of Program and Description of Workshop Exercises
Robert Stake "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation"
List of References
List of Participants

Week #1 Package

Index
Revised list of participants
Viewing the Videotapes
Questions for videotape
Stufflebeam "Developing Evaluation Design"
Evaluation Plan I: "Does the gifted program in our school increase the student's ability to conduct independent study?"
Evaluation Plan II: "Which of these three sets of science materials should we use in our elementary science course?"
Evaluation Plan III: "Are we selecting the right students for our class in creative writing?"
Suggestions for Role Playing

Week #2 Package

Garth Sorenson "A New Role in Education: The Evaluator"
Exercise on Rating Scales
Attitude Scale Exercise
Glossary of Statistical Terms
Computation of Chi-Square
Computation of Pearson r
Computation of Spearman rho
Computation of t-test and Mann-Whitney U
Computation of Correlated t-test
One way and two way analysis of variance
Evaluation Plan IV: "Has the gifted program had an effect on the achievement of the participating students?"

Accessories

Video Tape I - Bob Stake and graduate student
"Does the gifted program in our school increase the student's ability to conduct independent study?"
Video Tape II - Terry Denny and graduate student
"Which of these three sets of science materials should we use in our elementary science course?"
Video Tape III - Tom Hastings and Douglas Sjogren
"Are we selecting the right students for our class in creative writing?"
Video Tape IV - Bob Stake and School Personnel
"The Evaluator Role"

Booklet

Cook, Desmond. *Program Evaluation and Review Techniques: Applications in Education*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Periodicals

"Improving the 'Natural System': EPIES Three Year Plan," *The EPIE Forum*, Vol. I, #5, January, 1968

O'Brien and Lopate. "Preschool Programs and the Intellectual Development of Disadvantage Children." *Occasional Paper: ERIC*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1968

Pamphlets

Griffin, Louise. "How to Use ERIC", 1968 Hjelm, Howard; Sherman, Marian. "The National Laboratory on Early Childhood Education: A Model of Educational Research and Development". Athens, Georgia: College of Education Publishing

University of Illinois, "Survey Research Laboratory" U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "ERIC Can Help"

Speeches

Howe, II, Harold. "Picking Up the Options"

Monographs

Goheen and Davidoff. "Biserial Correlation Graph for Test of Significance"

Stake, R. E. List of "Educational Objectives"

Stake, R. E. "Guide to the Evaluation of an Evaluation Plan"

"Summary of Categories for Interaction Analysis"

III. EVALUATION of the SUMMER INSTITUTE on EVALUATION

Scheme

For our evaluation design, we are indebted to the evaluation of the 1966 AERA Presession.[1] Although we did not intend to emulate this design, its logic became more compelling as we thought about what we wanted to know and as we developed our design. For us, however, concern about the long term development of our materials dictated the collection of detailed information about their use. In this respect, our schemes differ.

To determine the immediate overall effect, we developed an achievement test and an attitude inventory on the evaluator role and administered them on a pre and post basis. Though we had no true comparison group, we used an advanced university class as a rough comparative measure on achievement.

The Participant Opinionnaire gave us the participant's overall reaction to the institute. The Participant Critique Form (which we copied almost intact from the Presession Evaluation) gathered participant reaction on more specific features of the institute e.g. the structure, interaction, and physical setting. These two instruments were post administered.

In order to ascertain the worth and impact of specific materials, video tapes, certain lectures, etc.-a critical input for further developmental work- we devised a participant interview schedule that involved interviewing half the participants during the first week and the others, the second week. Although this instrument somewhat duplicated items in the Opinionnaire and the Critique Form, such redundancy was not objectionable as the data were soft, the instruments untested, and the participants' reactions subject to fluctuation over time.

---

[1] Report of the AERA 1966 Presession on Experimental Design

Realizing that instruments cannot and do not record many significant events that occur at such institutes, we used an unidentified observer-historian to collect data. These observations, corroborated by other instruments, proved to be very valuable--particularly in dealing with the lack of social interaction, the least effective phase of the institute. By recording and succintly describing what we did, the observer also made a valuable contribution since, quite naturally, our actions differed from our intents.

Possibly the most important immediate indicators of the institute's success are the evaluation plans that the participants produced. (See pages 45-60) Although our immediate evaluations of these plans could only be rough estimates of success, through follow-up sessions with the participants we will be able to evaluate the long range effects. Ultimately, an excellent evaluation of a local program will provide a criterion of success; but we shall not impose high standards for no two-week institute could resolve the deeply rooted problems in evaluation that for too long has been virtually neglected.

The evaluation of immediate effects documents the success of the initial step, the training of evaluators. In order to evaluate long term effects, we must acknowledge and cope with the problems that conditions within local districts generate.

The Observer's Report

Introductory note:

One main participant observer attended all sessions and completed observation schedules for each. In an attempt to produce a reliable score, his ratings were compared with two other CERLI staff members who alternately rated sessions.

Ratings of the tapes and lectures reflect the observer's judgments and informally gathered participants' reactions and attitudes.

Information about the small group work sessions was collected and studied by the three CERLI staff members who informally interacted with participants. What the participants communicated (either on the critique or during the structured interview) seemed to validate the main participant observer's report and the data other instruments provided.

The observers' instruments (roughly based on the observer's report of the AERA 1966 Presession) were extensively revised to complement the style of this institute.

See Appendix-4 for schedules and proposed revisions.

Institute Organization

The best description of the institute's atmosphere probably would be that of flexible but structured. Daily changes in the schedules (pages 13 & 14) reflect its flexibility. However, the observation schedules show that the starting times were strictly adhered to and that the participants' attendance was extremely high and punctual.

The Participants

Attempting to find a common feeling or attitude toward various aspects of the institute (such as the level of difficulty of a particular lecture) often was impossible because of the participants' diverse backgrounds. When the observer did elicit their common reactions, only such matters as facilities would be verbalized. Perhaps the participants' reactions to the lecture on statistics best illustrates the observer's difficult task:

> About one third of the participants (whose statistical background was minimal, if any) considered the lecture too difficult to comprehend. Another third (whose background was extensive) considered the lecture time-wasting because the lecturer dealt only with theoretical aspects and did not explain how to use this knowledge in working with their evaluation plans. The other participants (who had taken some basic courses) appreciated the opportunity to review and update their fundamental knowledge.

Although all participants admitted that each speaker (with one exception) had taught them something, their diverse and individual backgrounds rather than the presentations or material apparently modulated their degrees of satisfaction.

Facilities

If listed on a continuum, comments about facilities would be predominately negative. The fact that there were no desks and that the chairs provided no writing surface complicated the extensive note-taking that participants needed to do. The room was small and, for some of the men, the space inadequate for comfortable "leg room". Speakers and participants criticized the inadequate blackboard space which was confined to a single, portable model.

During the second week, participants seated in the back rows were continuously distracted by noise from an adjacent room. On three occasions, staff members tried to alleviate the problem. Only by reserving the adjoining room for the same two-week period and using it for small group sessions when needed could the problem have been solved.

On one occasion, TV monitors set up to show various video tapes obscured the lecturer's notes on the blackboard. Otherwise the placement and use of monitors were effective.

Although participant interaction was adequate, it could have been much better and it could have occurred sooner. This observation was validated by casual comments on the last day when several people admitted they still didn't know the names of all the participants which then numbered 25. (Five applicants did not attend; two left during the second week to fulfill job commitments; one left because of illness.)

Participants thought they should have worn name tags the first morning and that an informal coffee and roll break would have prevented them from clustering in small groups of friends or strolling alone during the break. They also thought that some time for the group to informally meet each other and discuss the orientation session, their individual hopes and fears about the institute, etc. should have been planned. These matters not only were discussed informally with the observers later in the institute, but also formally expressed in some of the structured small group sessions. Ideally, strong relationships could have been established in the small groups. Originally, each group included some members whose ability and potential leadership were outstanding and a member of the CERLI staff who would function as a catalyst or a recorder. The other participants were assigned to one of these five groups.

Actually, the groups had little opportunity to form a strong and cohesive unit. In the second meeting on Tuesday morning, groups I and II and groups III and IV merged because there were not enough available rooms to accommodate each group.

At the next opportunity for small group meetings, the speaker asked participants to form small groups among those seated near them to discuss possible ways of taking unobtrusive measures. Such shifting of personnel may have been a factor in the lack of leadership development among the participants. Whatever the reason, CERLI staff members had to assume more and more control in helping the groups focus on and accomplish their respective tasks.

Another factor affecting group development was the fact that the structured purposes of the meetings often changed or at times seemed very general. This flexibility contributed to some groups' ineffectiveness because the CERLI staff neither had anticipated nor had been trained for this role in group leadership. Some participants thought that if speakers had worked with various small groups, problems in speaker-participant rapport and group leadership might have been alleviated.

Lecturer-Participants Interaction

Because interaction between lecturer and the group often did not occur, many of the structured responses on the observation schedules were marked "inconclusive". For example, if participants asked only one or two questions, the relevance or depth of the discussion motivated by a lecture could not be conclusively stated.

(In some instances, the audience did not respond because the speaker posed either rhetorical questions or questions eliciting only a negative response.) However, speakers who involved the group generated positive reactions and motivated questions. For example, interaction occurred during Dr. Stake's lectures on test construction and Q-sorting (scaling) and Dr. Denny's talk on unobtrusive measures.

During the early sessions of the first week, the participants' insecurity among their peers and their lack of experience with evaluation as presented at such a theoretical level prevented many of them from asking questions. One lecture that did activate the group was a graduate student's presentation of textbook evaluation. Although the group generally agreed that the lecture had not been particularly informative, the opportunity to challenge a speaker who seemed unsure of himself and who (in their opinion) presented misinformation encouraged participants to express their ideas to the group. After this experience or critical incident, participants remained unresponsive only once. For the most part, only lack of time terminated interaction or discussion during the rest of the institute.

Participants' Response

Achievement

The staff prepared but had no opportunity to try out the achievement test before the institute. In constructing the 20-minute test, the staff attempted to relate lecture content to the 46 test items.

Administered both as a pre and post measure, the instrument provided the following data.

> After the 2-week session, the 3.40 gain in test scores was significant at the .01 level. However, the pre-test score might reflect the fact that participants had had an opportunity to read Stake's "The Countenance of Evaluation" before coming to the institute and to the extent that they had read and absorbed this material (included in test content) their pre-test scores would be influenced.

To compare the post-test performance of the group, Dr. Stake asked students who recently had taken his course in Educational Psychology at the University of Illinois to take the test. However, the pseudo-control group proved to be very small as only five students responded to the mailed request and enclosed test. The 5 tests indicated a mean slightly higher than the institute participants but beyond that any further interpretation would be meaningless.

> Using the split-half method of determining reliability and the Speakman-Brown prophecy formula, analysis of pre-test results shows reliability to be .71. An analysis of variance performed on the same data indicated reliability to be .68.
>
> However, item analysis based on the 7 upper and 7 lower scores in the group indicated 14 of the 46 items within acceptable difficulty and discrimination levels.
>
> Five of the items (representing 50% of this sub-test area) appeared in the Multiple Choice section of the test.

The minimal background material on participants prevented an analysis of effects of background variables on performance and thus weakened score interpretation. More background material also would have been useful in examining attitude inventory.

One participant commented that the post-test created some anxiety during the last two days of the institute. Others felt that the pre-test somewhat structured the material to be learned during the two weeks.

(For a copy of the test and additional information, see Appendix .)

Attitude

The attitude inventory (Appendix 6) was built on the basic assumption that educators' negative or positive reactions to given statements of opinion would provide their perceptions about evaluation. In this instrument, statements were meant to convey the role of an evaluator and the nature of evaluation. For the most part, the statements were culled from positions made by Stake, Scriven or Sorensen; a few were provided by the authors of the instrument.

In order to discover what change in attitude occurred during the two weeks of the institute, the attitude inventory was designed as a pre and post instrument. (According to the evaluation of the 1966 AERA presession, changes in any category reflecting differences of 15% between pre and post measures could be considered significant.)

In this instance, however, measuring change was complicated by the fact that the attitude inventory included many items reflected in Stake's "The Countenance of Evaluation" that participants had received and presumably read before coming to the institute. In spite of this potential influence, however, the following fourteen items did show a significant shift from pre to post in the various categories: SA (strongly agree), A (agree), ? (undecided), D (disagree), and SD (strongly disagree).

(Pre-test percents appear above the responses; post-test, below)

1. "The role of the evaluator should be that of a describer rather than a grader."

31	50	8	8	3
SA	A	?	D	SD
46	42	0	12	0

After the institute, more participants strongly agreed with this statement, but the shift was not a dramatic one.

5. "One of the first things an evaluator must do is obtain a list of behavoral objectives."

12	42	23	19	4
SA	A	?	D	SD
19	50	8	19	4

The undecided category showed a shift in this item. There were fewer individual participants in this category after the institute than before. The shift was to the slightly agree and strongly agree categories.

7. "Evaluators often pay too much attention to what they have been urged to look at, and too little attention to other facets."

35	42	12	11	0
SA	A	?	D	SD
23	58	12	7	0

More people agreed with this statement after the institute, although the shift came basically from the strongly agree category.

8. "The kind of data gathered in an evaluation should seldom be determined by what the groups are like that will receive the results of the evaluation."

12	8	19	35	26
SA	A	?	D	SD
4	12	0	19	65

There were significant shifts in categories on this item. At the end of the institute, no one was undivided on the question and the big shift moved toward the strongly disagree category.

9. "As long as hoped for outcomes occur, it is not important that objectives be stated clearly."

0	4	0	54	42
SA	A	?	D	SD
8	15	4	35	38

The shift took place in the slightly disagree category. After the institute, many participants shifted from this category to a more positive position.

10. "The most important use of evaluation findings is to change the program."

4	15	19	50	12
SA	A	?	D	SD
0	31	15	38	16

A significant shift took place in the slightly agree category, more respondents responding to this category after the institute.

11. "The evaluator is the person best qualified to judge an educational practice."

12	23	23	31	11
SA	A	?	D	SD
8	38	12	42	0

More were in slight agreement with the item after the institute.

12. "It is possible to evaluate a program without knowing the goals of the individual teachers."

4	12	19	31	34
SA	A	?	D	SD
8	31	4	38	19

Significant differences occurred in three categories after the institute. Few were undivided after the institute; more were in slight agreement with the statement; and fewer strongly disagreed.

13. "The personal characteristics of the evaluator are a major determinant of the evaluation."

0	27	19	38	16
SA	A	?	D	SD
8	58	8	23	3

A shift occurred within two categories on this statement. More slightly agreed and fewer slightly disagreed.

14. "It is not practical to draw conclusions in evaluating a program prior to the program's completion."

4	35	0	50	11
SA	A	?	D	SD
4	4	4	69	19

A shift took place between the slight agreement and slight disagreement categories. Few slightly agreed after the institute; more slightly disagreed.

17. "It is up to the local educator to rule out the study of a variable because it is not one of his objectives."

0	4	19	54	23
SA	A	?	D	SD
4	19	0	58	19

The shift in this statement took place between the undecided and slight agreement categories. After the institute no one was undecided; more slightly agreed.

18. "No school can evaluate the impact of its program without knowledge of what other schools are doing."

4	50	8	38	0
SA	A	?	D	SD
12	12	15	46	15

Here the shift took place between extreme categories. From slight agreement, the shift was toward the disagreement scale, with a number of participants strongly disagreeing; no one had strongly disagreed on the pre-attitude inventory.

21. "An evaluator has the right to decide what to evaluate."

4	34	15	35	12
SA	A	?	D	SD
4	54	4	35	3

On this statement, more slightly agreed with the item after the institute.

25. "Absolute standards, e.g. the judgments of people, should not be applied to a program."

4	8	8	69	11
SA	A	?	D	SD
0	4	4	62	30

More participants strongly disagreed with the statement on the post-attitude inventory.

In addition to comparing the changes that took place in the participants' attitudes before and after the institute, another comparison between the attitudes held by an expert and those held by the participants can be made. Ideally, one would hope that there would be a shift in the participants' attitudes after the two week session toward those held by the expert. This in fact did occur.

Though the expert's ratings or attitudes do not reflect the entire staff's thinking, they do provide some absolute basis for comparing the intended and actual outcomes of the program. In this case, the expert was a member of the institute's evaluation staff.

For comparative purposes and for the purpose of performing a statistical test of significance, the pairs of categories in a like direction (SA & A, D & SD) were merged. For example, a rating of A (slightly agree) given by the expert encompasses the rating SA (strongly agree) or vice versa, and a rating of D (slightly disagree) also encompasses SD (strongly disagree). The category of ? (undecided) is treated as a single unit. Thus, if the expert marked a statement with A, the participants' reaction in both A and SA categories is merged in one category for comparative purposes against the rating given by the expert.

For example, the expert indicated slight agreement with statement #1 (shown in the Appendix 6) and 81% of the participants either slightly agreed or strongly agreed on the pre-attitude inventory (31% of the participants marked SA and 50% marked A). After the institute, 88% either slightly agreed or strongly agreed (46% for SA and 42% for A). Thus, 81% on the pre-test and 88% on the post-test then are considered as agreeing with the expert--a 7% gain after the training session.

During the session, participants' evaluation attitudes on the attitude inventory, taken as a whole, shifted toward those held by the expert. This pre to post attitude inventory shift toward the area that the expert considered desirable was significant at the .05 level. This change was equivalent to the shift of almost two individuals moving across all items toward the expert.

Opinionnaire

Participants' response to the opinionnaire (administered at the close of the session) provided information about the institute's physical facilities, content, relevance. Most participants considered the housing and dining facilities very satisfactory. The meeting and work rooms, however, were less satisfactory.

On the whole, the participants seemed quite satisfied with the institute's content. They did suggest, however, that activities could be better organized; that scheduling could be improved; that small groups be assigned specific tasks; that more practice in developing instruments would be beneficial. One participant felt that alternative approaches to evaluation also should be presented at the institute.

For the most part, participants felt that the institute related to their interests and background and that the experience had been valuable. They wished to pursue (either independently or at another workshop) topics that had been introduced at the institute. Of particular interest were statistics and Stake's evaluation model.

Specific responses to the opinionnaire:

1. Did you have enough information about this workshop before you arrived? Yes: 17. No: 4.

2. (If no) What else would you like to have known about?
   All of the references. Each objective at the beginning
   of the institute.

3. There are many parts of a Workshop experience that can either contribute to your satisfaction or detract from it. For each of the following, would you let us know how satisfied you've been?

1. Really outstanding
2. Very satisfactory
3. Just acceptable
4. Need improvement

NR/NA. No response/not applicable

	1	2	3	4	NR/NA
a. Meals	1	16	2		2
b. Hotel rooms	1	14	1		5
c. Meeting rooms	1	7	10	3	
d. Other facilities or services . .	1	16	3	1	
e. Facilities for working	1	13	7		
f. Opportunity for discussion . . .		7	8	6	
g. Presentation in general	16	5			

(If you have checked "need improvement" for any of the foregoing, please note below any suggestions you may have.)

Library needs to be more centrally located.
More time--help on problems.
More group mixing needed.
Larger meeting room with tables.
More person to person contact.
Grouping on basis of problem areas.
Small group feedback after each major presentation.

4. Would you describe the one or two most valuable ideas that you received from attending the Workshop?

.. Survey research methodology.
.. Evaluation is not an exact science.
.. Stake model for sifting data.
.. Evaluation as a describer.
.. Information on scaling, questionnaires, etc.
.. Interview training.
.. Subjective data can be classified as to be useful for evaluation.
.. Evaluation is continuous.
.. A small part of the program can be evaluated.

5. As far as you're concerned, what would have most improved the Workshop?

.. More interaction among participants.
.. Alternative approaches to evaluation plan.
.. More small groups scheduled.
.. Assignment of tasks to be carried out by sub-groups among the participants.
.. A background in statistics.
.. More time for more detailed lectures by the experts in the field.
.. Better distribution of lectures and work sessions.
.. More small group interaction--groups changing rather than static.
.. More time actually organizing for activities.
.. More practice in developing instruments. Sharing ideas for these instruments.
.. Better meeting room--work room.

6. Which one of these phrases best states how related this workshop was to your interests and background?

a. It was over my head	0
b. I understood almost everything but the conference missed my main interests	2
c. It dealt with my main interests in an understandable and interesting way	19
d. It was too basic, few if any new ideas	0

7. Which of the following statments comes closest to stating your general reaction to the total Workshop?

a. The most valuable educational experience of my life	0
b. An outstanding program, I received much from it	15
c. Many parts were valuable, others not very	5
d. I gained something from attending but less than I expected	1
e. It was almost a complete waste of time	0
f. (Other)	0

8. After this Workshop is over, is there anything related to the Workshop topics that you would like to know more about or to study further?

a. Yes	19
b. No	1
c. No Response	1

9. (If yes) What specifically would you like to study?

.. Statistics	5
.. Stake's evaluation model	4
.. Interviewing, questionnaire development	4
.. Developing rating scales	1
.. Flander's method	1
.. Bibliography for future reading	1
.."I'd like to know as much about evaluation as my one cell can tolerate."	1

10. (If yes) How would you like to do so?

a.	Study on my own	3
b.	Attend a class that meets weekly	0
c.	Attend another Workshop	3
d.	Take a course by correspondence	1
e.	In a local study group	0
f.	(Other)	2
	No response	3

Combinations of the above

(a) and (b)	1
(a) and (c)	5
(b) and (c)	2
(c) and (e)	1

If you have further comments on the Workshop, please write them in your own words.

I would feel somewhat lost if there were no follow-up.

I think if I had had enough time to read some of the recommended bibliography before, I would have better understood the lectures, especially terms used.

Rapid pace might profitably be reduced by extending it over an additional week.

Really appreciated freedom to question, discuss and choose areas of study.

A number of participants felt that the staff presupposed that they had more background in statistics and mathematics than they did. In fact, some felt that more time should have been devoted to statistics than some other topics that were considered.

Participants' reactions to environment and facilities, scheduling and organization, content and presentation are reflected in the following tabulations and commentary.

Environment and facilities

1. (a) To what extent did the relative unavailability of books and journals interfere with your attempts to master the content of this session?

No interference: 14. Little interference: 5. Interference: 5.

Those who indicated "no interference" stated that the institute's concentrated program precluded reading time and that reading after rather than during the session would be more meaningful. One person had brought some recommended textbooks for reference during the institute.

Those who indicated "interference" suggested that available books would have stimulated reading or that references cited at the institute should have been available. One person wanted to use some statistical tables and read some articles that had not been provided.

(b) To what extent did reproduced materials given to you by the staff improve matters?

Most responses indicated that this material helped a great deal. Two indicated that more articles should have been provided.

2. (a) Did you feel that you lacked a "place to work," either alone or or in small groups?

All but two responded "no". One indicated the need for a work room equipped with typewriter, reference materials, etc.

(b) If you had a room at the Union, was it satisfactory?

All living at the Union responded "yes".

(c) If you did not have a room at the Union, did your staying elsewhere make the institute any more or less worthwhile to you?

All but three responded that housing made no difference. Two considered it a disadvantage. One considered it advantageous.

3. (a) Which features of the meeting rooms were inadequate or not conducive to learning?

Lack of table and writing surfaces, inadequate blackboard space, distraction from adjacent rooms, handling of equipment.

(b) Which features were especially facilitative in the same regard?

Central location, number of available rooms, air-conditioning, "opportunity to work with Dr. Stake's graduate students".

Scheduling and Organization

4. (a) Was two weeks too long a period to leave your work at home for the purpose of attending this session?

   Twenty-two said no; the rest said yes but stated it was worth it.

   (b) Was two weeks too short a period in which to learn much of the content of this session?

   Twelve of the 24 respondents said "yes"; one did not answer; eleven said "no" (two qualified their "no" with the exception of statistics).

5. (a) Were you allowed enough time in which to pursue activities of your own choosing?

   Yes: 18. No: 4.

   Two respondents qualified their answers. One said "no" to the first week and "yes" to the second week. The other stated that the activities of the second week were not described enough. "There should have been more of a push to get something developed on a tentative basis and turned in after the first week."

   (b) Would you have preferred not to meet in the evening after dinner?

   Yes: 8. No: 3.

   The remainder, for the most part said "yes" and "no", "sometimes", "didn't mind". One said "no" to lectures in the evening but added that other activities were fine.

   (c) Would fewer meetings per day have been preferable?

   Yes: 3. No: 14.

   The rest of the participants felt it was "dependent upon content", "sometimes" it would be preferable, "an individual matter", "dependent upon lecture time as work session time." A few said "sometime" or "not always" and one did not respond.

   (d) Would you have preferred more meetings per day than there actually were?

   Yes: 3. No: 16. No response: 1.

   One said 4 meetings per day is enough; another said "on certain days"; one stated "sometimes" and one stated "it depended upon lecture time vs. work session time."

6. (a) Were the individual lectures too long to sit and listen or take notes?

Yes: 2. No: 12. No response: 9.

One respondent said the lectures were too long when two lectures were consecutive.

(b) Were the lectures scheduled in an appropriate sequence?

Yes: 13. "Usually", "not always", "Sometimes": 5.
No response: 3.
Other responses:
"In regard to information, seemed logical; to assignment, no."
"Hastings should have been scheduled earlier when we still were working on plans."
"Statistics earlier-measures-then model-finally develop individual plan."

7. (a) Did you have sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants?

Yes: 13. No: 8. "Not always": 3.

8. (a) Were the instructors too inaccessible or unapproachable so that you did not get the individual attention that you desired?

Yes: 2. No: 14. "Sometimes," "Not usually," or "to a slight degree": 7.

One participant commented, "If we could have had the coffee break together it might have been easier to express my ideas in a more relaxed atmosphere."

One respondent stated that the instructors were very approachable, although they could have been available more during work sessions.

(b) Would it have been advisable to have had a few highly-trained graduate student assistants present from whom you could have obtained help on individual problems?

Yes: 10. No: 7. "Possible": 4. No reactions: 3.

(c) Were the staff members helpful in any way?

Yes: 21. Most or some: 2. No reactions: 1.

9. (a) Did the attempts to evaluate your progress and reactions during the session (and at this moment) interfere with your work here?

Yes: 2. No: 22.

(b) Do you begrudge the time you have spent here answering such questions as these on this critique?

Yes: 0. No: 23. "Well!": 1.

10. In general, was the institute well organized?

All said "yes". One qualified the answer by stating there was poor scheduling. One individual said "One of the best institutes I have attended"; another, "Better than previous ones attended."

Content and Presentation

11. (a) Did the content of the lectures and readings presuppose far more previous training (in math and statistics) than you had?

Yes: 7. No: 11. "Perhaps at times": 6.

(b) Should less training in these areas or more have been presupposed?

(This question was unclear to participants.)

12. To what extent was the content of the lectures and readings relevant to what you hoped to accomplish during the session?

Many misinterpreted this question; some indicated some relevance.

13. Do not be reluctant to single out a staff member for praise or censure.

Denny: 7. Stake: 4. Ernie: 3. All contributed: 9.
Sjogren: 1. No response: 2.

13. (a) Were the lecturers stimulating and interesting?

Yes: 15. "Usually", "Most": 7. Some: 1. ?: 1.

(b) Were the lecturers competent to speak on the subject assigned them?

All stated "yes".

(c) Were the lecturers well prepared?

Yes: 21. No: 0. Some, not: 3.

14. Were you disappointed in any way with the group of participants?

"No!": 15.

Others commented:
"Seemed to be a left skewed distribution of participants, a few were rather uncommunicative."
"At first I felt the group should have been more homogenous in background--I believe now that the heterogenity of the group was a positive influence."
"Too many varying backgrounds."
"I thought there would be more classroom teachers; not enough classroom teachers."
One participant did not respond.

Answer each of the following only by checking the more appropriate blank:

15. If you had it to do over again would you apply for this institute which you have just completed? Yes: 24. No: 0.

16. If an institute such as this is held again would you recommend to others like you that they attend? Yes: 24. No: 0.

17. Do you anticipate maintaining some sort of contact with at least one member of the institute staff? Yes: 22. No: 1. No response: 0.

18. Do you feel that your understanding of evaluation has been considerably enriched in these two weeks? Yes: 24.

19. Is it likely that you will consult in evaluation with someone else attending this institute? Yes: 22. No: 2.

A few punctuated the "yes" with a question mark or "Hope so."

20. Would you say that because of this institute you are more able to state a given evaluation problem in operational form so that it is, if it can be, amenable to solution? Yes: 24. No: 0.

21. Do you feel that the staff should feel that it has accomplished its objectives during this two week institute? Yes: 23. ?: 1.

Interviews

In order to elicit participants' perceptions about lectures, materials, video tapes and the overall institute design (organization and procedures) and to gather data about the participants' potential application of these learning variables in their own situations, interviews were conducted. Interviewers asked how beneficial and helpful the institute had been, whether the components had been convenient or available, if the experiences had been understandable.

At the end of the first week, half the participants (selected at random) were interviewed; the other participants were interviewed at the close of the second week. After the initial interviews, suggestions for altering the second week were incorporated in the presentation. From all the interviews, suggestions for altering the program were culled for future reference.

In the following itemization of participants' suggestions and the staff's observations (informally made after the institute), individual suggestions reflect only personal rather than the group's views.

...Short term suggestions

"Review the next day's schedule and purpose."

Observation: This was done only once.

"Explain other activities and agencies such as CERLI and those on the Urbana campus and include what is happening now."

Observation: In lieu of taking institute time for this, it was suggested that interested participants write to CERLI.

"Not sure which of staff will be helpful-need background data about staff."

Observation: Some but unsuccessful attempt was made to alleviate this situation. One lecturer declined to give information.

"Clarify following-through plans; purpose and meetings."

Observation: In response to questions, the participants expressed the need for follow-up activity- preferably in task-oriented groups rather than a general meeting. The CERLI staff indicated that future planning and meetings might take place at the laboratory in Northfield.

"Need more free time to study."

Observation: During the first week, no formal assignments were made. During the second week, no evening sessions were held; but this week seemed almost anticlimatic.

"Participants-staff relationships i.e. coffee together at break, evening parties, etc."

Observation: During the second week, coffee was served. During the first week, a party was given; none was given the second week.

"Help people more with statistics: get them to work on it, try it."

Observation: Not much done about this suggestion.

"Bind everyone's evaluation plan for critique and future reference."

Observation: The plans will be circulated.

"Need more copies of Mirrors of Behavior."

Observation: During lectures, this text was cited but apparently only four participants used it during the institute (although it might have been circulated without being checked out). Observers suggested that lecturers identify relevant references for participants to read before attending the scheduled lecture.

"Statistic tables, square root tables, etc. needed."

Observation: Not provided.

"Role playing for practice and to get to know each other."

Observation: Not done.

"Small group reaction to tasks (?) material, and evaluation problem."

Observation: Nothing done.

"Staff members as facilitators."

Observation: For the most part, Dr. House's staff felt that their lack of training in small group leadership precluded this function.

"Need time (five minutes or so) to think and ask questions."

Observation: Lecturers were not told this although they should have been. More interaction between lecturers and participants should have taken place. More rest periods should have been scheduled.

"Show more alternative uses of models and techniques."

Observation: Sorenson was referred to but his ideas were not developed.

"More discussion of what the video tapes show and more discussion after their viewing. Make more tapes accessible to individuals for viewing."

Observation: Nothing done the second week although the tapes were shown hourly.

...Long term suggestions

The following participants' suggestions and criticisms offer specific comments for planning future institutions- particularly the recurring points that reflect mutual comments. Like the short term suggestions, however, many statements reflect individual rather than group opinion.

Orientation...

More small group work on expectations.
Want to get to know people-meet participants.
Some kind of overviewing beforehand.

Procedures and Descriptions...

Provide clearer picture of participant role following the institute.
Follow-through plan.
More staff time with participants.
Better meeting facilities.
Pay more attention to what threatens participants.
Some simulation and problem approaches. Include role playing.
Two weeks not long enough: Let participants have more time for study and formulating evaluation plans.
More grouping for instruction.
Build in even more options.
Point out need for participants to have a high tolerance for ambiguity.
Give participants a chance to critique each others' plans.
More work sessions the first week.
More opportunity to talk with experts.
More variation in scheduling-lectures too long.
There were too many work sessions in a row and too many lectures in a row.
More time on interviewing, role playing, etc.
Should have done a pre and post role playing.
Chance to meet others and see progress (using video tapes).
Lack of communication between participants and staff.

Force participants to work through statistical problems with staff.
Terminology used by lecturers often confusing.
Some participants felt that secretarial service, typewriters, prepared lecture guides, sample scales and questionnaires, statistical tables and more statistical problems should be provided.
Hastings was too difficult.
The sequence of lectures not satisfactory.
The ERIC visit was of no value.
There was too much assumed about participant background.
The participants were split on statistics-some knew it; others, not.
Some of the participants felt that they would not be able to use parts of the training because: (1) they had no access to control groups, (2) statistics would be done by someone else (3) no video taping equipment available, (4) the teachers were not sure of the potential use of the institute.
Lectures too classroomy.
Participation should be limited to administrators.
There should be more on student behavior.
Participants should be more homogeneous.
Dr. House's staff should have been more involved.
Integrate a developed instrument of the second week in the evaluation plan of the first week.

Materials and Video Tapes...

Have a large definite reading list prior to institute.
Send materials earlier.
Edit tapes--too long. Describe purpose.
Show some relationships between tapes and evaluation plans.
More concentration on understanding the statistical exercises.
Work on evaluation plans--some should be programmed as opposed to class oriented.
Closer look at tests, scales, and other measures.
Plan to bind all evaluation plans.
Develop a progression tape showing levels of planning.
The tapes needed editing and a greater variety of interviews needed to be shown. Some felt more personal interaction with Stake would have been more beneficial than watching Stake on video.
There seemed to be a big gap between the video tapes and the written plans. The problem of the tapes did not seem related.

Positive and General Reactions to Total Experience...

Lectures are good, relevant, interesting.
Would have come even if there was no stipend.
Been excellent--great.
Video tapes excellent learning device.
Materials just what needed.
Unobtrusive measures-things even teachers can do.
Caliber of staff--stimulated.
Lectures pertinent--understandable.

Practical--useful video tapes.
Evaluation plans model for writing.
Lecturers don't talk above us. Good information.
Different approach to evaluation. That's good.
Statistical exercises, practical, easy.
Stake alluding to community attitudes.
Ways at getting at information.
Speakers cover all areas of gifted programs.
Evaluation plans served as models.
Sharing of ideas, hearing about what other programs are doing, anything that was considered as input in designing evaluation, pre and post idea, these were considered (other) useful activities.

Personal Opinions...

Relaxing of evaluation philosophy. Greater picture.
Staff provides help and service, not telling how much they know.
Non-religious attitude toward evaluation.
Good to hear authors of concepts.
To get examples of what is in concept papers.
Like to hear what authorities think should be done and questions to be answered.
Staff work with participants' problems.
Needed most of the information.
Like Staff's attitude toward evaluation.
Don't feel (as once did) that evaluation is impossible.
Dynamic personalities.
Models good--appropriate.
Stake's model and lecture were considered by the first group of participants to be of the most benefit.

Evaluation Plans

At the conclusion of week one, participants submitted their plans which a staff member read, annotated and rated. Since only a few participants previously had attempted any kind of evaluation, the "ratings" of the group's plans would seem to indicate a worthwhile effort: 10 "good", 9 "adequate", 3 "inadequate".

Among the "good" plans, the following have been selected for publication in this report.

EVALUATION PLAN FOR GIFTED PROGRAM

Lombard, Illinois

Problem: Can a more positive attitude be created in which the program can operate?

School situation:

The independent study group consisted of nine fifth and sixth grade students. They were selected from six classrooms consisting of approximately 160 students. The selection was made according to the results of the Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests, the Stanford Achievement Tests, the Torrance Tests of Creative Ability, and to a lesser degree on the judgment and recommendations of previous teachers.

In general, the children selected to be given the Torrance Test were those whose intelligence quotients were 120 or above and who were achieving at or above the 95th percentile on the Stanford Test. The Torrance Test was then administered and from this data, along with teacher recommendations, students were selected who scored highest on an over-all basis.

Problem situation:

Several students in the group had mentioned that they felt they were the most intelligent children in the entire school; that they were the "smartest, the obvious leaders." This was not mentioned to the director, but rather discussed among the students as they worked.

On occasion the students did mention to the director that they were missing some event or examination in their regular classroom. They seemed to be torn, at such times, as to whether they would rather remain in the regular classroom or attend the independent study group.

Evaluation Plan:

Rationale:

Those administrators and staff members in the district who are involved with the gifted program feel that talented youngsters will benefit from the opportunity to work independently on topics of their own choosing. However, it is also felt that the above mentioned negative aspects of the program can be detrimental to the youngsters, as can the conflict in loyalties (being forced to choose between the regular classroom teacher and the director of the independent study group). Furthermore, it is not our intention to develop an elite group or a group that considers itself to be elite.

Purpose:

The purpose of this evaluation is to ascertain the attitudes of the children in the group concerning their participation in the independent study program and the attitudes also of the other children in the fifth and sixth grades toward the participants. Also the attitudes of the other staff members must be considered.

The children involved in the program seemed to feel set apart from the other children. On occasion they were not included in such special activities as field trips, opportunities to hear guest speakers, or the viewing of films, filmstrips, or plays, as these activities were scheduled on the half day they were out of the room. They also were often out of the regular classroom when new skills or concepts were presented or when examinations were administered.

Some of the children had the impression that they were intellectually superior to all other children in the school, since they had been selected to be included in the program. They expressed the belief that they were entitled to special privileges (election--automatically--as class officers, highest grades in the regular classroom, special field trips, equipment, and materials not made available to the other children) because of this supposed "superiority."

Procedures:

A. The following procedures will be used as a guide to measure the students' attitudes regarding their participation in the independent study group.

1. Administer sociograms in the fall to all fifth and sixth grade students before selection is made regarding participants in the independent study program. This sociogram will determine: (a) who the children feel are the room leaders, (b) who are their best friends,

and (c) who they would least like to sit beside. Readminister these sociograms again at mid-year and at the end of the year to assist in locating changes in relationships.

2. Interviews with members of the selected group conducted by the school psychologist in the fall and periodically throughout the year to ascertain their entering attitudes and any changes in attitudes.

3. Hold general group discussions to vent their feelings.

B. The following procedures will be used to measure the attitudes of the other fifth and sixth grade students toward the participants in the independent study program.

1. Administer the previously mentioned sociogram at the three suggested times to determine changes in friendships as a result of participation in the program.

2. Meet with these children and explain to them the whole scope of the program so that they will better understand what their classmates are involved with when they are out of the classroom.

C. The following procedures will be used to assist in the interaction with fellow staff members and the community.

1. Invite the teachers to periodically visit the independent study program to observe what is taking place.

2. Report frequently to staff members regarding the progress of the program as a whole. Perhaps this could be worked into building meetings on a once-a-month basis.

3. Confer on an individual basis with the fifth and sixth grade teachers whose students are involved in the program reporting on the work of those students.

4. Confer with the principal regarding any feedback he may receive from other teachers or from the community.

5. Try to obtain feedback from various parents in the school community.

6. Prepare a list of suggestions or recommendations regarding classroom activities on the half-day the children are out of the room. (Examples: avoid special activities such as guest speakers, etc., avoid examinations on these days, and refrain from the presentation of new skills and concepts during this half-day period of time.)

EVALUATION PLAN FOR DEMONSTRATION CLASSES FOR GIFTED CHILDREN

Marion, Illinois

Problem:

Does the demonstration program for gifted children in our school increase the students' ability to think divergently?

School Situation:

In this junior high school of approximately 900 students, students from all the unit elementary schools are identified in the sixth grade for the gifted classes in English, social studies, and science through a three-fold testing program including the SRA Achievement Test, the Otis-Lennon Test of Mental Maturity, and The Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (Form B). Scores on these tests (or, in the case of the SRA tests, scores of those areas for which identification is taking place) are converted to stanines ranging from 1 to 9. The stanines for the three criteria are added, so that total stanine scores for any individual student could range from 3 to 27. Those students (approximately 30 per subject area) with the highest stanine averages are then placed in the demonstration classes. Since identification procedures distinguish between content abilities, any individual child may be in only one or all three special classes.

Students who are identified for the junior high program are normally expected to remain in the program for three years. Rarely is a student who was not originally identified allowed to enter one of the programs after the seventh grade (especially in English and social studies) since these studies are highly sequential as well as inductively presented.

With only minor variations in the selection criteria described above, the demonstration program has been in operation in English and social studies for four years and in science for one year. The English classes use the Project English curriculum developed at the University of Illinois under the direction of Dr. James McCrimmon. The social studies classes use the Project Social Studies Curriculum also developed at the University of Illinois under the leadership of Dr. Ella Leppert. The science classes use accelerated content and emphasize a laboratory approach to learning.

Problem Situation:

The teachers in the demonstration classes are aware that the identification procedures used are designed, at least in part, to select students who are not simply "bright" in the sense that they achieve at a high level but who also have the ability to think more creatively. The materials used were specifically designed to encourage discovery learning and to stimulate divergent-evaluative thinking as described by J. P. Guilford. This being the case, one question which interests the teachers is whether the program does, in fact, increase the students' ability to think divergently.

The Director of the Demonstration Center agrees that the question should be examined. He has agreed, therefore, to provide whatever data he possesses and materials for such an evaluation. The guidance person who has been assigned to the gifted program will administer various tests, and the Demonstration Center secretary will provide clerical services.

Evaluation Plan

Rationale:

The gifted program in this school is committed to a great extent to the philosophy that in a complex society such as ours, factual knowledge, per se, is of less benefit in producing citizens who can function effectively in their environment than is process knowledge. That is, that those individuals who are best able to cope with complex situations are not those who think primarily on cognitive-convergent levels, but those who think on divergent-evaluative levels as well.

Consequently, the school has provided homogeneous classes for those students who have been identified as most likely to benefit from a program designed in part to encourage divergency.

Purpose:

The primary purpose of this evaluation is to determine whether students who participate in the demonstration classes do increase their ability to think divergently.

A second, somewhat parallel purpose is to attempt to identify specific aspects of the program which tend to enhance or inhibit the development of the students' ability to think divergently.

Procedures:

I. Pre-and-Post Tests

A. Torrance Test of Creative Thinking

Since all students in the program have taken the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking prior to their inclusion in the gifted program, a re-test of that same test will be administered at the end of each academic year. Since the thought skills demanded on this test are primarily divergent, a change in the students' composite performance scores would indicate a change in their ability to think divergently.

Perhaps as an attempt at control, a random sample of other children in the school could also have the re-test administered to them. (All children in the school unit were originally tested.) Although these children are not comparable to the gifted class in many ways, an increased ability to perform tasks requiring divergent thinking equal to the increased ability of the students placed in the gifted program would invalidate the idea that the gifted program rather than maturity was responsible for increasing this particular ability.

By administering the tests at the end of each year (or perhaps the alternate form), periods of greatest enhancement or inhibition should be readily observable. The design of the materials or experiences in those time periods which show greatest enhancement or inhibition could then be analyzed carefully for suggested changes in the curriculum.

B. Guilford Consequences Test

The Guilford Consequences Test might also be given to the incoming seventh graders at the beginning of the year and then again at the end of either each academic year or at the end of the three year program to be used much as the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking will be used.

II. Classroom Observation Devices

Several classroom observation systems will be used at frequent intervals in each of the gifted classes in order to assess exactly what kind of behavior is occurring in the classroom, what kind of atmosphere is generated, and what kinds of thinking the teacher is asking the students to do. This measure will be compared to ideals set up by the demonstration teachers. For example, the teachers feel that in order to stimulate divergent thinking on the part of the students, a teacher should aim for a non-authoritarian, friendly manner and that he should teach concepts inductively. If the observation tools, however, reveal that generally the teacher is authoritarian and teaches deductively, then this data would be of significance in analyzing the degree of change (or lack of it) in the students' ability to think divergently as a direct result of our program.

In order to examine many facets of the classroom situation, all of the following observation systems may be implemented through the use of personal observation, audio tape recordings, and video tape recordings:

A. The Flanders Interaction Analysis
B. The Denny Observation Scale
C. The Galloway Non-verbal Interaction Analysis
D. The CERLI Behavior Analysis

III. Interviews

At various points in their academic careers, the students will be interviewed individually and in small groups by various personnel such as state consultants, guidance personnel, and teachers. Carefully designed interview formats will be followed to elicit information regarding an increased ability to think divergently. If possible, some interviews might be conducted even after the students have left the junior high school setting. For example, the hindsight afforded high school seniors or college students who had been in the program might provide significant information.

IV. Unobtrusive Measures

In addition to the more formal procedures outlined above, teachers will be asked to take note through the year of information gleaned from casual conversations with students, with other teachers, and with parents. Those teachers responsible for sponsorship of various student organizations such as Student Council, the science club, or the art club will be asked to keep a record (rather informally) of ideas and contributions the gifted students make to the organizations to which they belong as possibly bearing on the individual's ability to think divergently.

EVALUATION PLAN FOR TABA SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

Park Forest Public Schools

Problem: Are teachers using the Taba Social Studies Curriculum changing their behavior in such a way that the gifted students in their classes are able to carry out the development of generalizations, i.e. interpret data and make inferences, at a higher level than those developed by less able students?

School Situation: Two years ago two of the nine elementary schools in Park Forest piloted the use of the Taba Social Studies Curriculum in their classes from grades one through six. Prior to the introduction of these materials a group of eleven teachers and administrators attended a one-week workshop conducted by Dr. Taba and her staff at San Francisco State College.

Following the first year of use, another group consisting of some of the original group plus several additional teachers attended a second workshop at San Francisco. During the second year of the program three additional schools began their use of the materials. Throughout the year, in-service activities were carried on under the direction of the administrator most involved in the program.

This summer the administrator responsible for the in-service aspects of the program will receive additional training at a two-week workshop and will have available for use during the year a packet of materials prepared under the direction of the Taba Project for the in-service program.

In the school year '68-'69, two additional schools will begin using the program for the first time. The two schools not in the program will be used when a control group is called for.

Classes in all of these buildings are heterogeneously grouped and average slightly under thirty students per class. Approximately eighty teachers will be involved in teaching these materials of which about twenty five will be teaching the program for the first time. Gifted students are identified but not separated for any classes. With the exception of music the classrooms are self-contained units.

Problem Situation: The State of Illinois Gifted Program has accepted the premise of the program: that is gifted students can be provided for in heterogeneously grouped social studies classrooms. Verification by means of an evaluation of this premise has never been accomplished.

According to Dr. Taba the program will be successful only if the teachers will follow certain generic teaching strategies which apply to any topic and practically any type of teaching situation. For the purpose of this evaluation, only the teaching strategies related to the development of generalizations will be studied.

Evaluation Plan: The following evaluation plan, developed after consideration of many aspects of the problem, should be considered as preliminary and subject to modification before being put into effect.

Rationale:

From the time that the Park Forest Schools first came into existence, less than twenty years ago, a basic philosophy of the district has been to provide for individual differences among all students. Through the years many methods have been tried, many materials used, a variety of teaching strategies employed in an effort to better reach this goal.

Along with this goal, the philosophy has included another aspect--that of working within self-contained classrooms with heterogeneously formed groups. The intellectually talented and the creative child are identified, even though some of the identification methods are open to question; but they are not placed into separate programs or classes.

Purpose

A primary purpose of this evaluation is to ascertain whether teachers using the Taba Social Studies Curriculum can and are using the planned teaching strategies necessary for the success of the program. If teachers are successful in using the strategies designed by Dr. Taba, the assumption is then made by Dr. Taba that these strategies will result in changes in student behavior, e.g. the ability to develop generalizations. The secondary purpose of the evaluation then becomes a matter of trying to determine if students do in fact develop the ability to make generalizations.

The third purpose is to determine if gifted students, as is claimed by Taba, develop generalizations in greater depth than do average or less able students.

Procedures

For the purpose of this evaluation the following procedures are proposed:

Teacher evaluation:

1. The Taba System of Classroom Observation will be used on a randomly selected sample of teachers using the Taba materials for the first time and on teachers in the two schools not in the program. These observations will be made at the beginning of the school year during social studies classes and will consist of five minute segments recorded at three different times.

One coder will work with these observations and from the data collected will draw up a profile of each teachers performance. During the last month of school this same procedure will be followed and a second profile prepared.

Three judges will look at these profiles independently and judge whether or not, in their opinion, the teacher had made significant changes in their performances in reference to their ability to help students make generalizations. These results will be compared and a final report on this aspect of the evaluation prepared.

2. A brief survey will be prepared for the Taba teachers to determine the following:

a. Teacher feelings as to whether or not they had changed as a result of being involved in the in-service program for the Taba Social Studies Curriculum.

b. Teacher feelings as to whether or not they were better able to take into account individual differences in their classes.

c. Teacher feeling as to whether or not the program provided gifted students an opportunity to develop cognitive thinking skills.

3. The Teachers' Handbook prepared by Dr. Taba lists and explains five teaching strategies for her program. Video tapes will be made of a randomly selected group of Taba teachers at two-month intervals. The teaching strategies as seen in these tapes will be compared to the ideal (as specified by Taba) by a panel and rankings will be prepared.

Student evaluation -

1. All students from randomly selected classes in the program and classes not in the program will be given a collection of data and asked to prepare a report on the basis of this information. A panel of three junior high social studies teachers not involved in the program will be asked to rank these reports on the students' ability to make inferences from the data.

Comparisons of these results will be made between control and experimental groups and between students identified as gifted and the less able students within the experimental classes.

2. An unobtrusive measure of the number and types of books used by students in the experimental classes will be taken. Since the books used in the program differ in complexity and type, it is hoped that this measure will give some clue as to whether or not the gifted students use more complex books and books in greater numbers in developing generalizations.

It is possible that the following unpublished documents by members of the Taba Project will yield other useful measures.

"Test Exercises in Listing, Grouping, Labeling and Generalizing Skills", A. H. McNaughton

"Informal Tests on Concepts and Generalizations", A. H. McNaughton

"Informal Evaluation of the Ability to Interpret Data in Written Materials and Make Inferences from Them", A. H. McNaughton

"A Generalization is a Generalization", A. H. McNaughton

On the basis of all the above listed evaluation procedures, a final report will be prepared.

EVALUATION PLAN FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY

RATIONALE:
The academically talented child readily learns and retains information. By his very nature he constantly is seeking new challenges to his thinking and creativity. Often, however, there is limited opportunity for him to apply the skills and information he has acquired in a way which is meaningful and rewarding to him. Thus, the need to establish an atmosphere which allows the child the freedom of alternatives and the opportunity for self-initiated activities becomes mandatory. With these facts in mind, the traditional

concept of the school's role in directing the student's efforts must be modified.

We are, therefore, faced with determining the kind of educational environment that will allow our intellectually superior children to use their talents to the greatest efficiency so that they can grow up to be effective, contributing members of our society.

INTENDED ANTECEDENT:

This project will involve an experimental and control group of intellectually superior sixth graders from the Holmes Junior High School. The students have been identified according to their scores on Large Thorndike Intelligence.

The experimental and control groups will consist of ten students per group. They will be randomly selected from the top ten per cent of the gifted class as determined by their IQ score. The final determinant will be their expressed willingness to participate in the experimental study and parental support of the undertaking.

INTENDED TRANSACTIONS:

This project will extend over a three year period beginning in September, 1968 and terminating in June, 1971.

The students selected for participation in the experimental group will be scheduled into accelerated classes as will those in the control group. Objective data, not included in the identification program, will be gathered at this time. In addition, data of a subjective nature will be collected. Such things as attitude toward school teachers, classes, classmates and assignments will be noted along with noticeable strengths and weaknesses in self-initiative, self-discipline and independence.

During these first weeks, the Project Director will be establishing the groundwork for a smooth transition from the existing program to the modified program for both students and classroom teachers. Interested teachers, the principal and the guidance counselor will be invited to serve with the Project Director in an advisory capacity. In addition, the Project Director will have contacted the parents of eligible students to explain the proposed program and enlist their support.

After involvement in assigned classes for approximately one month, the experimental group will meet with the Project Director and the Interdisciplinary Team who will provide an orientation to the proposed program and indicate the range of options to which the student will be entitled. Every effort will be made to encourage a trusting relationship between the students and the Team. The student association with these staff members should not be threatening. The students should look upon them as resource people and guides in the process of educational decision-making.

After the orientation session, the experimental group will meet with the team to consider the following:

1. The role of the school
2. Educational objectives
3. Diagnosed strengths and weaknesses
4. Areas of interest and needs

At this point, each child in the experimental group will be given the option to determine:

1. Which classes to attend
2. What assignments to pursue
3. How to use time away from class
4. Where to spend time away from class
5. With whom to spend time away from class

The Project Director will be available to assist the students and consult with the students at all times. Members of the Team will also be available upon request.

As part of the developmental sequence of the program, the students' initial options will be very limited. The progress of each child in adjusting to these will determine the point at which additional options providing for greater independence will be introduced.

INTENDED OUTCOMES:

This program has been designed to provide the Elk Grove School System with data which will indicate the appropriateness of a program of this nature for the gifted junior high population.

We hope to show that:

1. Given the freedom in which to operate, the intellectually superior child will eventually become a more productive individual.
2. He will learn to make educational decisions and evaluate the consequences for these decisions in an environment where guidance is readily available.
3. Involvement in this program will not adversely affect achievement; instead, the child will apply his skills and information in a way which is more meaningful and rewarding to him.
4. Teachers will re-evaluate their role with greater emphasis on the real needs of these students.

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

$RO_1 \ X \ O_2$

$RO_1 \quad O_2$

This study will consist of two groups of ten children who will be selected on a random basis from the top ten per cent of the sixth grade class.

determined by their scores on the Lorge Thorndike Group Intelligence test.

$$O\ X_1\ O$$
$$O\ X_2\ O$$
$$O\ X_3\ O$$
$$O\ X_4\ O$$
$$O\ X_5\ O$$

A pre and post test on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills will be administered at the beginning and end of the school year as a measure of achievement. Additional pre and post scores from the Lively, Grove, and Dempster Jr. High gifted programs will be analyzed to see if the program at the Holmes Jr. High has affected a change in achievement compared to other sixth grades in addition to determining any significant change between the two groups of ten in the experimental program.

A measure of self-direction will be developed to aid in identifying those children who display characteristics which seem to their ability to perform in an independent study program. If time permits, Suchman, Inquiry Training and Critical Thinking will be administered during the year to determine whether a positive correlation between self direction and these measures exists. It is hoped that by gathering as much data as possible, we will know more about this illusive quality of self reliance, be better able to identify it and begin to know what will help children develop in this capacity.

Cumulative record information will be gathered, conferences with parents, teachers and students will be anatated, class attendance records will be checked to determine how often children who are given options of whether or not to attend class actually option not to.

An independent Study questionnaire covering the major areas of Acceleration, Content, Resources and Evaluation plus a questionnaire on Change in Behavior and Relative Effects of Technique Compared to other Techniques including the areas of Learning--Content, Learning--Study Habits, Attitudes, and Social Interaction will be given to the group at the end of the school year to get an affective measure after one year of the program.

A questionnaire to the community covering the full expanse of the educational programs will be developed to aid in understanding what the community views as important for their children and to determine how much understanding they do have in regard to the educational provisions of the district.

The In-Service program for teachers will include a section devoted to evaluation as a "tool to understanding." They will be introduced to some of the basic skills of test construction and interpretation and will work on developing a rating scale or checklist for use in their classroom. The teachers will be introduced to self-assessment techniques such as Style of Teaching Inventory and Flanders Interaction Analysis. The Flanders will be used as a tool for noting changes in teacher directed--student directed behavior as the school year progresses. Half-hour segments will be collected once a week on a random basis. The school's psychologist and the director of research and testing for the district will be an integral part of this section of In-Service.

Upon collection of the data, appropriate statistical analysis will be done with the results aiding in determining the direction of the program.

EVALUATION PLAN FOR
ASSESSING INFLUENCE OF INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS ON OTHER TEACHERS' PRINCIPLES AND TECHNIQUES

The Problem:

To what extent have teachers attending the 1968 Summer Institute at the Eastern Illinois Development and Service Unit been able to influence other area teachers (2500) with respect to principles and techniques presented in the Summer Institute?

Demographic Data:

Seventy-two teachers attended Summer Institute 1968. These teachers represented 50 school districts in a ten-country area providing educational facilities for 30,000 youngsters. (See attached lists of participants, their school districts and subject material areas.)

Problem Situation:

Summer Institute participants have been administered three scales described as follows:

1. Attribute Preference Inventory:
   This inventory was developed by John R. Hurley and Christie Randolf of Michigan State University to elicit information concerning how undergraduates in child psychology valued assorted behavior qualities in young children. We feel that the summer school participants will exhibit significant different ranking behavior on

these attributes as a result of their participation in the summer school program. The instrument has been used in several studies as a measure of conventional vs. expressive. Comparisons will be made between a pre-and post-administration of the inventory. With this additional variable we plan to differentiate between male and female participant responses. In addition, an analysis of the differences between rankings by summer school participants, staff and student counselors (eight students employed to work with the summer institute program).

2. Style of Teaching Inventory:
   This instrument was originally designed for teachers to administer to their students to receive feedback information regarding specific teacher character as perceived by students. We are using this scale to analyze differences between "expected real" and "ideal" teaching behavior as perceived by the summer institute participant. The results of this scale will be compared with norms developed for the participants. This self-assessment instrument represents one of several which have been made available for use by teachers throughout the summer program.

3. Summer Institute Questionnaire:
   The objectives of this questionnaire are to determine the relative expectations of participants with respect to the summer institute program and the utilization of concepts developed within local school districts during the coming year. Included are some survey questions to determine the needs for in-service education in the program development. The final report will include an analysis of data and information collected between forms A and B of this questionnaire.

The significant problem facing us at this time is to develop a follow-up study which will include consultative services to these teachers as they implement "Plans of Action" at their respective school district. Copies of these plans are available. Tentative plans for individual follow through have been made with specific participants, and this information is included as reference material in this plan.

Rationale:

It is intended that a "critical mass" of teachers be trained in self-assessment techniques and the development of new teaching behaviors, and that furthermore, these teachers would influence other area teachers. It is assumed that through this "critical mass" education for the 30,000 youngsters in the EIDSU ten-county area will benefit from improved educational programs.

Purpose:

The purpose of this study is to gather information, analyze data and interpret results that relate to the degree to which this "critical mass" has developed and a significant number of area teachers have been influenced by summer institute participants.

Procedures:

In addition to the follow through visavis and the attached Plan of Action, the following considerations are to be made:

1. Summer Institute Participants:
    a. Degree to which they have effectively implemented their Plan of Action as described.
    b. Information relative to teaching behavior through the use of the verbal interaction analysis matrix (CERLI), the Style of Teaching Inventory, The Flander's Interaction Analysis System, and other tools used for self-assessment as employed in the Summer Institute.
    c. Attitudes and reactions of participants of the role of the Summer Institute in subsequent professional development and change teacher behavior.

2. Area teachers other than Summer Institute participants:
    a. Teacher rating scales utilized on a random basis over a period of time -- to be compared with norms developed on the data collected.
    b. Information related to attitudes of these teachers towards self-assessment and the implementation of new teaching behaviors.

3. Local school district administrators:
    a. Degree to which Summer Institute participants are given the opportunity to conduct in-service programs in the local level.
    b. Role of the administrator in implementing the Plans of Action developed by Summer Institute participants.

IV. SUMMARY

During a two-week institute, the training of 30 public school personnel as evaluators was undertaken. Among the participants, relatively few had any background in research and even fewer had previously conducted any evaluations.

For the institute, a design and several materials and instruments were developed. In content, the workshop evolved from evaluation planning to skill training in specific data-gathering techniques.

Since all the trainees were directly or indirectly involved with the Illinois Gifted Program, the institute was planned to capitalize on their background by introducing and promoting good evaluation in the context of each participant's immediate problem in his local situtation. Such a realistic approach afforded students the opportunity to work with real data, solve their immediate problems, share ideas with other participants and to simultaneously learn concepts and techniques of evaluation. Thus, it was felt, participants would be more highly motivated and would more easily comprehend and retain concepts and techniques of evaluation. Apparently this approach was effective or so a short term analysis seems to indicate.

Basically, a participant's progress during the institute was assessed by examining the test instruments and reading the completed evaluation plans.

Analysis of pre and post measures taken on the students indicates that significant shifts in attitude toward evaluation occurred during the institute. (This directional shift approximated attitudes held by an evaluation expert.) Students also made significant gains on the achievement test after the two-week experience.

The fact that participants completed evaluation plans (submitted for review and circulation) that they actually can use in their local situations represents a meaningful measure of the institute's success.

Adversely, however, problems of interaction, heterogeneity, and continued direction affected the institute. Feedback from the instrumentation underscored the problem of interaction: trainees consistently expressed need for interaction among participants and between experts and participants.

The fact that both administrators and teachers were enrolled in the institute accounts for the problem of heterogeneity. Not only did administrators and teachers seem to have few mutual interests but each group related to the institute's content quite differently. Teachers experienced difficulty in relating to the material and recognizing its practical application in their local situation. Conversely, administrators found some of the material (statistics, for example) repetitious.

The problem of continued direction developed during the second week of the institute. There seem to be two reasons why the participants' sense of purpose and feeling of satisfaction somewhat declined. For one thing, participants were not involved in nor committed to a specific task which the development of an evaluation plan had provided during the initial week. During the second week, some participants may have been frustrated by the necessity to make choices predicated on a knowledge of the entire field and identification of their own needs and priorities. For the conscientious but less knowledgeable participant, this activity generated problems.

Major Conclusions

1. It is possible to train public school personnel in evaluation techniques within a short (two-week) period.

2. The design and materials developed for this institute proved to be very effective.

3. The institute's weaknesses were a lack of personal interaction and, during the second week, an inadequate sense of direction.

   (Better selection procedures and minor reorganization should alleviate these flaws.)

   The fact that participants' use of resource facilities was minimal may have been due to the necessarily time-consuming thrust of the two-week program.

4. Long-range problems, including conditions within the local district that inhibit evaluation, must await follow-up meetings.

5. Suggestions for improving the institute and materials are incorporated in this report.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

A. Letter

B. Brochure

C. Application

D. Observation Schedule A

Observation Schedule B

E. Attitude Inventory

F. Achievement Quiz

G. Participant Opinionaire

H. Participant Critique Form

I. Participant Interview Schedule

(Parts I & II)

COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH LABORATORY, INC.

540 W. FRONTAGE ROAD
NORTHFIELD, ILLINOIS 60093
PHONE: (312) 273-2444

Dear Sir:

This summer we are conducting a two-week institute on evaluation. We have an excellent staff and expect to have some good training materials. We also hope we have a fresh approach. Although the evaluation institute is focused on the gifted, the techniques and materials are readily applicable to any educational program. We hope to involve personnel from Title III projects or other programs. We are particularly, though not exclusively, interested in those with some research training. We think that this institute may enhance the evaluation of your project or school program and invite someone from your district to apply.

Sincerely,

Ernest R. House

Ernest R. House
Project Manager
Project for the Evaluation of
 the Illinois Gifted Plan

EVALUATION INSTITUTE: "Gifted Programs"

****

Staff:

Terry Denny
Educational Products Information Exchange

Douglas Sjogren
Colorado State University

Robert Stake
University of Illinois

Ernest House
Cooperative Educational Research Laboratory

****

University of Illinois
Urbana

July 29 - August 9, 1968

TOPICS:

Common Problems in Evaluation of Projects

Application of an Evaluation Model

Measurement Problems

Assigning Priorities to Objectives

****

COMMITMENTS:

Participants will examine evaluation problems in their own programs and bring a brief (perhaps 120 words) written summary of problems to the institute.

Participants will develop alternate evaluation plans for their own programs.

Participants will attend follow-up sessions during the academic year.

Participants will develop an information pool based at CERLI (with the exception of such information they may wish to confidentially submit to support funding of their own programs).

SUPPORTING AGENCY:

Office of the Superintendent
of
Public Instruction
State of Illinois

SPONSORS:

Center for Instructional Research
and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE)
(University of Illinois)

****

Cooperative Educational Research
Laboratory, Inc. (CERLI)
"Gifted Evaluation Project"

Stipend: $75 per week

Apply to:

Dr. Ernest R. House
CERLI
Box 815
Northfield, Illinois 60093
(Telephone: 312 - 273-2444)

APPLICATION FOR SUMMER WORKSHOP
IN EVALUATION

Date ____________________

NAME: (Mr.) (Mrs.) (Miss) ____________________ (Last) (First) (Initial)

ADDRESS: ____________________

____

PHONE: ____________________

SCHOOL DISTRICT: ____________________

TYPE OF CENTER: ____ Demonstration ____ Reimbursement ____ Experimental

PRESENT POSITION: ____________________

Please describe, briefly, your previous research training and experience:

Please describe any evaluation efforts you are currently engaged in:

Will you be in a position next year to do some kind of evaluation of your district's gifted program?

PLEASE RETURN TO:

Dr. Ernest R. House
Project Manager
Cooperative Educational
Research Laboratory, Inc.
P.O. Box 815
Northfield, Illinois 60093

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE - A

Speaker ____________________ Date ___________ Lecture ____ Tape _____

Scheduled Starting Time ____ Actual Start ___ Difference _____________

Scheduled Finishing Time ___ Actual Finish ___ Difference _____________

Staff in Attendance House ___ Stake ___ Denny ___ Hastings ___ Sjogren ___

Number of Participants in Attendance: ____

A. Observer's rating of the speaker's communication with the participants:

1. speaker encourages questions ___ discourages questions ___

comment ____

2. total number of questions asked ___________________________________

3. speaker sensitive to audience reaction ___ insensitive ___

comment ____

B. Rating of participants' questions and reactions:

4. questions relevant ___ questions not relevant ___

comment ____

5. questions insightful questions not insightful ___

comment ____

6. participants comfortable ___ participants not comfortable ___

comment ____

7. participants bored ___ interested ___ enthusiastic ___

comment ____

C. Participants' attitudes toward instructional techniques:

8. materials distributed ___ materials not distributed ___

9. materials relevant materials not relevant ___

comment ____

10. audio-visual equipment used ___ not used ___

11. equipment produced an effective presentation ___ not effective___

comment ____

D. Participants' attitude towards presentation:

12. lecture __ tape __...well prepared __; adequate __; not well prepared __

comment ____

13. lecture __ tape __...presentation dull __; adequate __; interesting __

comment ____

14. lecture __ tape __...presentation disjointed __; coherent __

comment ____

15. lecture __ tape ___...level of material difficult __; moderate __; easy__

comment ____

16. lecture __ tape __...following discussion shallow __; moderate __; deep__

comment ____

17. lecture __ tape __...relevant to stated objectives __; irrelevant __

comment ____

18. lecture __ tape __...relevant to participants' needs __; irrelevant __

comment ____

GENERAL COMMENTS:

____

____

____

____

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE - B

Date ____________________ Time Session ____________________

Group Work Session ____________ Individual Work Session ________

	generally yes	inconclusive	generally no
1. Did the participants feel that their time could have been better spent in another activity? ____________________ ____________________	________	________	________
2. Did the participants feel that they were sufficiently involved with the expected task? ____________________ ____________________	________	________	________
3. Did the participants attempt to accomplish their assigned task or to work on their evaluation plans? ____________________ ____________________	________	________	________
4. Did the participants believe they actually accomplished something during this time spot? ____________________ ____________________	________	________	________
5. Did the participants feel they needed more structure for this time? ____________________ ____________________	________	________	________
6. Did the participants feel they needed more guidance or help from the staff for this time spot? ____________________ ____________________	________	________	________

ACHIEVEMENT TEST

1. Formative evaluation is aimed more at long-range generalizations about instruction than is summative evaluation.

2. One critical task for the evaluator is to combine the judgments of merit and shortcoming into a single consensus of program value.

3. The educational program having goals that are clearly understood and stable is a better program than one having goals that are only implicit and changing.

4. Educational evaluation is essentially the same as educational research in terms of techniques used and in terms of questions to be answered.

5. The value of a model such as Bloom's Taxonomy or Stake's "countenance model" comes in using the categories to sort the different items or data after they have been collected.

6. It is wrong for the evaluator to try to get the educator to state his objectives in terms of student behaviors.

7. Item discriminability coefficients should exceed .50 if a 30-item test is to have the usually acceptable amount of reliability.

8. Questionnaire information is the least reliable and useful information evaluators collect.

9. Interviewing as a method of inquiry is universal in the social sciences.

10. The literature of anthropology serves as an example of the products obtained through interviewing informants.

11. The following may be obtained from empirical studies and used to appraise survey results:

    Estimates of variation between elements in the population and between various groupings of these elements.

    Cost factors and analyses, cost relationships.

    Data of established accuracy for use in testing and correcting ordinary procedures.

12. The size of samples, method of drawing it, and other features of the survey design will not be affected by the kind of analysis to be made of the results.

13. The best starting point for any design is to be found in the aim that the survey is to fulfill.

14. The simplest and most satisfactory test of the accuracy of an estimate from a sample survey is not a direct comparison of the estimate with the true value of the variable being estimated.

15. A study of attrition rates will be of little help in identifying sources of bias.

16. Sampling variability is the amount of variability that arises through repeated application of a given sampling procedure.

17. We cannot ordinarily expect to get very substantial gains in accuracy in the estimation of a population proportion through the use of stratification.

18. Unobtrusive measures compete with formal experimental design to provide information to educational decision makers. That is, one must choose which has the higher likelihood of reducing error in collecting data.

19. Quality of teaching as a source of error can be controlled by Flander's interaction analysis for the four groups of sixth graders.

20. Archives might include examining science-teacher-of-the-year candidates careers.

21. Sampling conversation in the teachers' lounge is an example of simple observation.

Choice

22. Which of the following is the outstanding obstacle to representing a program's objectives and priorities?

    a. teachers are not oriented to student behaviors
    b. goal statements and indicators are oversimplifications
    c. no educationally meaningful unit of "investment" exists
    d. goals cannot be represented by numbers, spatial areas, vectors pie-graph sectors, etc.

23. Interviews typically yield subjective data--descriptions of the world of experience--for which of the following?

    a. goals
    b. perceptions
    c. attitudes
    d. all of the above
    e. none of the above

24. The Chi square technique is commonly used for

a. describing groups in terms of "fine measurement" data
b. testing hypotheses regarding "fine measurement" data
c. describing groups in terms of frequency counts
d. testing hypotheses regarding frequency counts

25. The Q Technique and conventional factor analysis are both techniques for

a. analyzing profiles of students
b. clustering "like things" together
c. comparing large numbers of groups
d. evaluating instructional television

26. The Q sort and the method of paired comparison are both methods which could be used for

a. assigning "priority values" to educational goals
b. measuring problem solving in students
c. designing a feedback loop for instruction
d. testing hypotheses

27. The process of generalizing from sample data to population conditions while at the same time specifying the investigator's confidence in drawing correct conclusions is known as

a. summative evaluation
b. interaction analysis
c. statistical inference
d. taking a calculated risk

28. Which of the following is usually not considered a major area of specialization for the educational research methodologist?

a. measurement, testing, instrumentation
b. research design, experimental controls
c. statistical description and inference
d. cost-benefit analysis, program evaluation

29. "In a statistics-book table of Chi square values, the entries in the .05 column indicate the boundary point between the 95% most likely Chi square values to be obtained from sample data and the 5% least likely Chi square values to be obtained from sample data"

The previous statement is true only if the samples are randomly drawn from a population where

a. the "null hypothesis" is true
b. the "null hypothesis" is false
c. all variables are interrelated
d. no subgroups (samples) have any meaning

30. It is usually not practical to use the method of paired comparisons unless the number of stimulus objects (things to be scaled) is

a. one
b. two
c. four to twelve
d. twenty to one hundred
e. at least two hundred

31. When using a rating scale, the observer

a. measures behavior by questioning
b. measures behavior by recording behavioral events
c. measures behavior by noting degrees of behavior
d. measures behavior by short time samples

atch each entry on the right with one of the three entries on the left by putting letter in the blank.

Emphasis

oint of View on Evaluation

______ Self study, motivate self-correction

______ Visitation by group of peers

______ Control groups, control variables

______ Correlation among student talents

______ The differences among individual students

______ The traditional subject-matter disciplines

______ Prediction of later student success

______ Comparison of educational "treatments"

______ Norm groups, percentile scores

Writings

______ Campbell and Stanley in the Gage *Handbook*

______ Thurstone on Test Theory

______ "National Study's" *Evaluative Criteria*

______ Tyler on the Eight Year

Evaluation Institute
Urbana, Illinois
July 29-August 9, 1968

ATTITUDE INVENTORY

Directions: For each of the statements below, mark the letter which indicates your agreement or disagreement with the statement according to the following code:

SA = I strongly agree with the statement
A = I am in slight agreement with the statement
? = I am undecided
D = I am in slight disagreement with the statement
SD = I strongly disagree with the statement

*

1. The role of the evaluator should be that of a describer rather than a grader.

31	50	8	8	3
SA	A	?	D	SD
46	42	0	12	0

2. The evaluator should determine whether the goals of a program are worthwhile.

19	31	12	31	7
SA	A	?	D	SD
8	31	15	31	15

3. Most decisions made in the public schools today are based on hunches, hearsay, and individual beliefs.

42	31	12	15	0
SA	A	?	D	SD
46	42	4	4	4

4. Findings from laboratory studies seldom are applicable to regular classroom activities.

8	23	4	50	15
SA	A	?	D	SD
4	15	8	54	19

5. One of the first things an evaluator must do is obtain a list of behavioral objectives.

12	42	23	19	4
SA	A	?	D	SD
19	50	8	19	4

6. A major role of the evaluator is to make explicit the standards by which an educational program is judged.

31	42	4	23	0
SA	A	?	D	SD
27	42	8	19	4

7. Evaluators often pay too much attention to what they have been urged to look at, and too little attention to other facets.

35	42	12	11	0
SA	A	?	D	SD
23	58	12	7	0

8. The kind of date gathered in an evaluation should seldom be determined by what the groups are like that will receive the results of the evaluation.

12	8	19	35	26
SA	A	?	D	SD
4	12	0	19	15

9. As long as hoped for outcomes occur, it is not important that objectives be stated clearly.

0	4	0	54	42
SA	A	?	D	SD
8	15	4	35	38

10. The most important use of evaluation findings is to change the program.

4	15	19	50	12
SA	A	?	D	SD
0	31	15	38	16

* Percent of participant endorsement on pretest appears above responses, percent endorsement on posttest appears below. The expert's choice is underlined.

11. The evaluator is the person best qualified to judge an educational practice.

12	23	23	31	11
SA	A	?	D	SD
8	38	12	42	0

12. It is possible to evaluate a program without knowing the goals of the individual teachers.

4	12	19	31	34
SA	A	?	D	SD
8	31	4	38	19

13. The personal characteristics of the evaluator are a major determinant of the evaluation.

0	27	19	38	16
SA	A	?	D	SD
8	58	8	23	3

14. It is not practical to draw conclusions in evaluating a program prior to the program's completion.

4	35	0	50	11
SA	A	?	D	SD
4	4	4	69	19

15. We can tell if an educational program is successful only by observing whether hoped for changes are occurring in the students.

4	38	12	35	11
SA	A	?	D	SD
12	31	15	31	11

16. In order to evaluate a program, equal resources should be devoted to what teaching is occurring as well as what learning is occurring.

31	65	4	0	0
SA	A	?	D	SD
27	12	0	11	0

17. It is up to the local educator to rule out the study of a variable because it is not one of his objectives.

0	4	19	54	23
SA	A	?	D	SD
4	19	0	58	19

18. No school can evaluate the impact of its program without knowledge of what other schools are doing.

4	50	8	38	0
SA	A	?	D	SD
12	12	15	46	15

19. The most appropriate instruments for evaluating educational programs are standardized tests.

0	0	4	62	34
SA	A	?	D	SD
0	12	4	54	30

20. Joyous distrust is a sign of health. Everything absolute belongs to pathology.

12	31	35	15	7
SA	A	?	D	SD
19	31	23	19	8

21. An evaluator has the right to decide what to evaluate.

4	34	15	35	12
SA	A	?	D	SD
4	54	4	35	3

22. The task of describing curricular objectives is the responsibility of the evaluator.

4	23	12	50	11
SA	A	?	D	SD
12	19	0	54	15

23.	The evaluator should identify unanticipated outcomes of the program.	31	65	0	4	0
		SA	A	?	D	SD
		27	58	4	8	3
24.	It is more important to compare local data with national norms than to compare it with local norms.	8	15	15	46	16
		SA	A	?	D	SD
		0	12	19	42	27
25.	Absolute standards, e.g. the judgments of people, should not be applied to a program.	4	8	8	69	11
		SA	A	?	D	SD
		0	4	4	12	30
26.	In selecting variables for evaluation, the evaluator must make a subjective decision.	12	61	12	8	7
		SA	A	?	D	SD
		15	77	4	4	0
27.	The most important use of evaluation findings is to justify the program to other groups.	0	23	12	42	23
		SA	A	?	D	SD
		0	23	8	50	19

PARTICIPANT OPINIONAIRE

Evaluation Workshop
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Now that this Workshop is drawing to a close, we are certain that you have some reactions as to what parts have been most valuable to you and what parts might have been different. This form is designed to make it easy for you to pass these reactions along to the workshop planners. It is important that every participant complete and return the opinionaire so that the reactions of the total group will be reflected.

The questions are designed to make it easier for you to express your reactions. If they do not provide sufficient opportunity, please write your comments in your own words. You do not need to indicate your name.

1. Did you have enough information about this workshop before you arrived?

   Yes 1 ( )
   No 2 ( )

2. (If no) What else would you like to have known about?

   ____

   ____

3. There are many parts of a Workshop experience that can either contribute to your satisfaction or detract from it. For each of the following, would you let us know how satisfied you've been?

   a. meals
      Really outstanding 1 ( )
      Very satisfactory 2 ( )
      Just acceptable 3 ( )
      Need improvement 4 ( )
   b. hotel rooms
      Really outstanding 1 ( )
      Very satisfactory 2 ( )
      Just acceptable 3 ( )
      Need improvement 4 ( )
   c. meeting rooms
      Really outstanding 1 ( )
      Very satisfactory 2 ( )
      Just acceptable 3 ( )
      Need improvement 4 ( )
   d. other facilities or services
      Really outstanding 1 ( )
      Very satisfactory 2 ( )
      Just acceptable 3 ( )
      Need improvement 4 ( )

e. facilities for working
   Really outstanding 1 ( )
   Very satisfactory 2 ( )
   Just acceptable 3 ( )
   Need improvement 4 ( )

f. opportunity for discussion
   Really outstanding 1 ( )
   Very satisfactory 2 ( )
   Just acceptable 3 ( )
   Need improvement 4 ( )

g. presentations in general
   Really outstanding 1 ( )
   Very satisfactory 2 ( )
   Just acceptable 3 ( )
   Need improvement 4 ( )

(If you have checked "need improvement" for any of the foregoing, please note below any suggestions you may have.)

____

____

____

____

____

4. Would you describe the one or two most valuable ideas that you received from attending the Workshop?

____

____

____

____

5. As far as you're concerned, what would have most improved the Workshop?

____

____

____

6. Which one of these phrases best states how related this workshop was to your interests and background?

a. It was over my head 1 ( )
b. I understood almost everything but the conference missed my main interests 2 ( )
c. It dealt with my main interests in an understandable and interesting way 3 ( )
d. It was too basic, few if any new ideas 4 ( )

7. Which one of the following statements comes closest to stating your general reaction to the total Workshop?

The most valuable educational experience of my life........... 1 ( )
An outstanding program, I received much from it............... 2 ( )
Many parts were valuable, others not very..................... 3 ( )
I gained something from attending but less than I expected.... 4 ( )
It was almost a complete waste of time........................ 5 ( )

________________________________(other)....... 6 ( )

8. After this Workshop is over, is there anything related to the Workshop topics that you would like to know more about or to study further?

Yes 1 ( )
No 2 ( )

9. (If yes) What specifically would you like to study?

____

____

10. (If yes) How would you like to do so?

Study on my own ....1 ( )
Attend a class that meets weekly.............................. 2 ( )
Attend another Workshop....................................... 3 ( )
Take a course by correspondence............................... 4 ( )
In a local study group.. 5 ( )

________________________________(Other)........... 6 ( )

If you have further comments on the Workshop, please write them in your own words.

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

Evaluation Institute
Urbana, Illinois
July 29-August 9, 1968

Participant Critique Form

Directions: Please respond with a word, a phrase, or one or more sentences to as many of the following questions as you can. Your frank and honest evaluation can only benefit everyone concerned. Do not identify yourself by name unless you prefer to do so.

Environment and Facilities

1. a. To what extent did the relative unavailability of books and journals interfere with your attempts to master the content of this session?

   b. To what extent did reproduced materials given to you by the staff improve matters?

2. a. Did you feel that you lacked a "place to work," either alone or in small groups?

   b. If you had a room at the Union, was it satisfactory?

   c. If you did not have a room at the Union, did your staying elsewhere make the Institute any more or less worthwhile to you?

3. a. Which features of the meeting rooms were inadequate or not conducive to learning?

   b. Which features were especially facilitative in the same regard?

Scheduling and Organization

4. a. Was two weeks too long a period to leave your work at home for the purpose of attending this session?

   b. Was two weeks too short a period in which to learn much of the content of this session?

5. a. Were you allowed enough time in which to pursue activities of your own choosing?

   b. Would you have preferred not to meet in the evening after dinner?

   c. Would fewer meetings per day have been preferable?

   d. Would you have preferred more meetings per day than there actually were?

6. a. Were the individual lectures too long to sit and listen or take notes?

   b. Were the lectures scheduled in an appropriate sequence?

7. a. Did you have sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants?

8. a. Were the instructors too inaccessible or unapproachable so that you did not get the individual attention that you desired?

b. Would it have been advisable to have had a few highly-trained graduate student assistants present from whom you could have obtained help on individual problems?

c. Were the staff members helpful in any way?

9. a. Did the attempts to evaluate your progress and reactions during the session (and at this moment) interfere with your work here?

b. Do you begrudge the time you have spent here answering such questions as these on this critique?

10. In general, was the Institute well organized?

Content and Presentation

11. a. Did the content of the lectures and readings presuppose far more previous training (in math and statistics) than you had?

b. Should less training in these areas or more have been presupposed?

12. To what extent was the content of the lectures and readings relevant to what you hoped to accomplish during the session?

13. Do not be reluctant to single out a staff member for praise or censure.

a. Were the lecturers stimulating and interesting?

b. Were the lecturers competent to speak on the subject assigned them?

c. Were the lecturers well prepared?

14. Were you disappointed in any way with the group of participants?

Answer each of the following only by checking the more appropriate blank:

15. If you had it to do over again would you apply for this Institute which you have just completed? Yes ______ No ______

16. If an Institute such as this is held again would you recommend to others like you that they attend? Yes ______ No ______

17. Do you anticipate maintaining some sort of contact with at least one member of of the Institute staff? Yes ______ No ______

18. Do you feel that your understanding of evaluation has been considerably enriched in these two weeks? Yes ______ No ______

19. Is it likely that you will consult in evaluation with someone else attending this institute? Yes ______ No ______

20. Would you say that because of this Institute you are more able to state a given evaluation problem in operational form so that it is, if it can be, amenable to solution? Yes ______ No ______

21. Do you feel that the staff should feel that it has accomplished its objectives during this two week Institute? Yes ______ No ______

Use the remaining space, if you wish, to give us your ideas on what was wrong with this session, or what was particularly commendable in it, or how it could have been done better. Try particularly to mention items which were not dealt with in the questions on the preceding pages.

Evaluation Institute
Urbana, Illinois
July 29 - August 9, 1968

Participant Interview Schedule*
Part I
(1st half)

Date Administered ______________________________

Name of Interviewer ______________________________

Introduction

1. Identify yourself if it is necessary.

2. Purpose: The reason that I have asked to talk with you has to do with your general reaction to the institute so far. The other interviewers and I are gathering this type of information so that the staff can better organize next week's activities as well as evaluate the overall training experience. While some things cannot be changed in this institute, I'm sure that all of your comments will be useful for designing future training programs of this type.

3. Anonymity: Your name will not be placed on this interview form.

4. Begin: Do you have any questions before we begin?

Institute Design

1. What has been the most beneficial to you in the institute so far?

____

____

____

Could you indicate why this is so? ______________________________

____

*EXPLORE EACH ITEM AS FULLY AS POSSIBLE BY ASKING SUCH QUESTIONS AS, "IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE?", "ANY OTHER IDEAS YOU WANT TO MENTION?", ETC.

2. Is there anything you would like to see happen more often? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES AND NO ELABORATION - What would that be? ______________________

____

3. In terms of the amount of time spent for activities such as lectures, structured groups, work sessions, video viewing, would you like to see the proportion of time alloted for these activities changed in any way? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - In what way? ______________________

____

Lectures

4. What is your general impression of the lectures so far?

COMMENTS	
POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
____________	____________
____________	____________
____________	____________

5. Do the lectures seem relevant to the other institute activities in which you are involved? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - In what ways do the lectures seem relevant? ______________________

____

____

IF NO - What could make the lectures more relevant? ______________________

____

____

6. Are there any aspects of the lectures which make them confusing or difficult to understand? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - What aspects? ______________________________

____

What could members of the staff do to improve this situation? ______________

____

IF NO - Are there any other comments you would like to make about the lectures?

Video Tapes

7. What is your general impression of the video-tapes you have seen?

COMMENTS

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
______________	______________
______________	______________
______________	______________

8. What would be your major criticism of the video-tapes?

____

____

____

____

CONSIDER CATEGORIES BELOW FOR CLASSIFYING STATEMENTS

AWARENESS

PHYSICAL QUALITY

CONTENT QUALITY

UNDERSTANDABILITY

PRACTICALITY

Materials

9. Are the materials, such as the books, papers, evaluation plans, and (statistical exercises) of any help to you? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - Which of these materials seem to be the most helpful to you?

____

____

How were they helpful? ____

____

10. What materials seem to be of little or no help to you? _______________

____

IF MATERIALS ARE INDICATED - Why does this seem to be the case? _________

____

11. What kinds of materials should have been provided which were not made available?

____

____

RECORD "WHY" IF SPECIFIED _____________________________________

____

Transferability

12. You mentioned that _________, _________, and _____________ were helpful to you (or you liked them). Of these and other activities that you mentioned, do you believe they are presented in such a way that they will be helpful to you in your own situation back home? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - Which ones will be helpful? ____________________________

____

Why? ____

13. Are there any (other) things occurring in this institute that you will find useful back home? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - What? ____

14. Are there some parts of the institute that you won't be able to use in your own situation back home? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - Which parts - IF NOT ELABORATED ______________________

____

RECORD "WHY" IF SPECIFIED ______________________________

____

Summary

15. Is there anything else the institute staff should know, so they might improve this experience for you? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - What would that be? ______________________________

____

16. If you were going to conduct an evaluation institute similar to this one, what changes might you make (other than what you have already indicated)?

____

GENERALLY REVIEW ALL OF THE RESPONSES CHECKING FOR CORRECTNESS OF INFORMATION AND ANY FORGOTTEN IMPRESSIONS.

"As I mentioned at the beginning of our talk, this information will be very helpful to the staff in making decisions about next week's activities as well as the designing of future training programs. Thank you for your time."

Evaluation Institute
Urbana, Illinois
July 29-August 9, 1968

Participant Interview Schedule*
Part II
(2nd half)

Date Administered ______________________________

Name of interviewer ______________________________

Introduction

1. Identify yourself if it is necessary.

2. Purpose: The reason that I have asked to talk with you has to do with your general reaction to the institute so far. The other interviewers and I are gathering this type of information so that the staff can better evaluate the overall training experience. While some things cannot be changed in this institute, I'm sure that all of your comments will be useful for designing future training programs of this type.

3. Anonymity: Your name will not be placed on this interview form.

4. Begin: Do you have any questions before we begin?

Institute Design

1. What has been the most beneficial to you in the institute?

____

____

____

Could you indicate why this is so? ______________________________

____

EXPLORE EACH ITEM AS FULLY AS POSSIBLE BY ASKING SUCH QUESTIONS AS, "IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE?", "ANY OTHER IDEAS YOU WANT TO MENTION?", ETC.

2. Is there anything you would like to have seen happen more often? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES AND NO ELABORATION - What would that be? ______________________

____

Is there any particular reason why you would like to have seen this happen more often? Yes ___ No ___

____

3. In terms of the amount of time spent for activities such as lectures, structured groups, work sessions, video viewing, would you have liked to see the proportion of time alotted to the activities changed in any way? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - In what way ______________________________

____

Lectures

4. What was your general impression of the lectures?

COMMENTS

Positive	Negative
________________	________________
________________	________________
________________	________________

5. Did the lectures seem relevant to the other institute activities in which you were involved? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - Did the lectures seem relevant? ______________________

____

____

IF NO - What would have made the lectures more relevant? ____________

____

____

6. Were there any aspects of the lectures which made them confusing or difficult to understand? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - What aspects ______________________________

What could members of the staff have done to improve this situation?

____

IF NO - Are there any other comments you would like to make about the lectures?

____

Video Tapes

7. What was your general impression of the video-tapes you have seen?

COMMENTS

Positive	Negative
______________	______________
______________	______________
______________	______________

8. What would be your major criticism of the video tapes?

____

____

____

____

CONSIDER BELOW CATEGORIES FOR CLASSIFYING STATEMENTS.

AWARENESS

PHYSICAL QUALITY

CONTENT QUALITY

UNDERSTANDABILITY

PRACTICALITY

Materials

9. Were the materials such as books, papers, evaluation plans, and (statistical exercises) of any help to you? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES Which of these materials seem to have been the most helpful to you?

____

____

How were they helpful? ______________________________

____

10. What materials seemed to be of little or no help to you? __________

____

IF MATERIALS INDICATED - Why does this seem to be the case? __________

____

11. What kinds of materials should have been provided which were not made available?

____

RECORD "WHY" IF SPECIFIED ______________________________

____

Transferability

12. You mentioned that ______________, ____________ and __________ were helpful to you, or you liked them. Of these and others that you mentioned, do you believe they were presented in such a way that they will be helpful to you in your own situation back home? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - Which ones will be helpful ______________________

In what way? ______________________________________

13. Were there any (other) activities occurring in this institute that you will find useful back home? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - What ______________________________

____

14. Are there some parts of the institute that you won't be able to use in your own situation back home? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - Which parts - *IF NOT ELABORATED* ______________________________

____

RECORD "WHY" IF SPECIFIED ______________________________

____

Summary

15. Is there anything else the institute staff should have known, so they might have improved this experience for you? Yes ___ No ___

IF YES - What ______________________________

____

16. If you were going to conduct an evaluation institute similar to this one, what changes might you make (other than what you have already indicated)?

____

____

(GENERALLY REVIEW ALL OF THE RESPONSES CHECKING FOR CORRECTNESS OF INFORMATION AND ANY FORGOTTEN IMPRESSIONS)

"As I mentioned at the beginning of our talk, this information will be very helpful to the staff in designing future training programs. Thank you for your time."